OBSTACLES TO PEACE

BY S. S. McCLURE

Eliza H. Camgan
from L. & L.
Oct. 27. 1917 (?)

OBSTACLES TO PEACE

OBSTACLES TO PEACE

BY

S. S. McCLURE

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge
1917

COPYRIGHT, 1917, BY SAMUEL S. MCCLURE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published March 1917

TO

HERBERT C. HOOVER

Chairman of the Belgian Relief Commission

I dedicate this book, because in maintaining the traditions of the men who made the Republic, he has rendered a greater service to his country than any other man of his time.

PREFACE

THE Obstacles to Peace are of two kinds: first, the questions involved in this war, which are territory, access to the sea, and national security; secondly, the states of mind of the peoples at war.

The world of to-day is small in relation to populations compared with past eras. The matters at issue are of crucial and capital importance. I have outlined these issues. It would be difficult to settle them if the nations at interest were friendly and filled with mutual trust and confidence. The reverse is the case, and I have tried to describe the extraordinary hatreds, contempts, and horrors that divide the warring nations; so I have given much space to the records of alleged atrocities. The most important single fact in Europe to-day is the feeling caused by belief in these records. This feeling constitutes the greatest single obstacle to an early peace.

I have tried to make a picture of the actualities. I have used documents lavishly. I preferred to give the actual documents rather than a summarization in my own words. Not all the material I have quoted is of equal value. The views of publicists and historians are valuable principally in giving the atmosphere of thought and the public opinion of a country.

All the authoritative documents, all the details of atrocities are believed absolutely by the peoples of one or the other set of belligerent nations.

I have quoted at length from Baron Beyens' book

Germany Before the War (Thomas Nelson's Sons), because the author, in Germany, where he is well known, is accepted as worthy of quotation in authoritative German utterances. The German Foreign Office and Prince von Bülow quote him frequently.

A very valuable book is the new edition of *Imperial Germany* (Dodd, Mead & Co.) by Prince von Bülow.

Those who wish to learn more of the diplomatic history from 1870 to 1914 will find an accurate book — *The Diplomatic Background of the War* (Yale University Press), by Charles Seymour, Professor of History, Yale College.

A study of the diplomatic correspondence of the thirteen days from July 23 to August 4, with much additional material, is to be found in *The Diplomacy of the War of 1914* (Houghton Mifflin Company), by Ellery C. Stowell, Assistant Professor of International Law, Columbia University.

The *New York Times Current History*, in bound volumes, preserves a vast amount of fundamental material.

The Rise of Rail Power in War and Conquest, 1833–1914 (J. B. Lippincott Company), by E. A. Pratt, is recommended to those who are interested in my chapter on the submarine.

An extremely interesting study of the war is being published by George Barrie's Sons of Philadelphia, written by Professor Allen, of the University of Pennsylvania. It is entitled *The Great War*. It is a very valuable work for the general reader.

Thanks are due to the several publishers named above for permitting the use of extracts reprinted in this volume; also to Mr. Robert W. Service and

Messrs. Barse & Hopkins for the stanzas from "Grand-Père" (*Rhymes of a Red-Cross Man*); to Messrs. Harper & Brother for the story of the Ems telegram from *Bismarck's Memoirs;* to Messrs. E. P. Dutton & Company for the passage from *Belgians under the German Eagle*, by Jean Massart; to Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons for selections from *Diplomatic Documents of the War;* to Messrs. Dodd, Mead & Co. for the extracts from Maeterlinck; and to Mr. Alfred Noyes for the quotation in chapter xv.

Ten years ago I visited England and Germany to study the situation that ultimately led to the War of 1914. At that time I met members of the Governments and many leaders of thought in both countries. In 1910, through the courtesy of Mr. Bernard Maimon, I had access to a huge mass of diplomatic material — the complete diplomatic correspondence between the Turkish Government and the other Governments of the world for the last twenty-eight years of the reign of Abdul Hamid (which papers had been removed from Constantinople at the time of his banishment) and the years following up to 1910. For the purposes of this book there is no such body of material in existence, and it is a great grief to me that I am unable to have these documents before me now. But the study of these dispatches gave me a very good background of knowledge of European diplomacy, for Turkey was, for many years before the war, the center of European diplomacy. It was in reading these dispatches that I first got a real impression of Sir Edward Grey.

From January 6 to April 26, 1916, I was mainly in Germany, with brief visits to Belgium, the Russian

East Front, Vienna, Buda-Pesth, and Constantinople.

From July 24 to October 7, 1916, I was in England and France, where I was able to get some first-hand knowledge. I also visited Verdun and the Argonne.

The value of this book lies in its documents. In selecting these my sole aim has been to present the same picture that the whole body of material would give.

When I give my impressions I tell things just as I saw them. Belgium bulks large in the book. I could not help it. Belgium will bulk large in public opinion for a long time to come.

Turkey gets nearly as much space as both England and France. That is because Turkey is the very crux of the Obstacles to Peace. The fate of Turkey is *the* issue of this war.

I have devoted considerable space to the question of responsibility for the war. This question will not die.

In an interview, October 23d, 1916, Sir Edward Grey said: —

> If we are to approach peace in a proper spirit, it can only be by recollecting and recalling and never for a moment forgetting what was the real cause of the war.
>
> Some people say: "Oh, we need not go back over that old ground now. Everybody knows it."
>
> You cannot go back to it too often. It affects the conditions of peace. Germany talks of peace. Her statesmen talk of peace to-day. They say: "Germany must have guarantees against being attacked again."
>
> If this war had been forced upon Germany, that would be a logical statement. It is precisely because it was not forced upon Germany, but forced by Germany upon Europe, that it is the Allies who must have guarantees for future peace.

And on the other hand, Von Bethmann-Hollweg always insists that Belgium must no longer be in a position to aid the enemies of Germany, and that Russia was the immediate cause of the war.

I owe a great deal in getting the material for the book to the assistance given me by the Governments of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, England, and France, and to many men in all these countries.

Without the long-continued and considerate kindliness and helpfulness of my wife this book would have been impossible.

S. S. McCLURE.

NEW YORK CITY, *February* 17, 1917.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE WORLD AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 1

Comparative status of Japan, Russia, Germany, the British Empire, and United States as to territory and access to the sea — New factors introduced into civilization during the nineteenth century.

CHAPTER II

ASIATIC TURKEY: THE BAGDAD RAILWAY . .

Agricultural and mineral possibilities of Asiatic Turkey — Asiatic Turkey the seat of great empires of antiquity — Turkey a natural fortress dominating Egypt, the Suez Canal, the Bosphorus, the Black Sea, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, Persia, India — Seat of power over Mohammedan world — Relation of Asiatic Turkey to England's power in Egypt and India — Germany's plan as to the Suez Canal — Significance of the Bagdad Railway — My interview with Talaat Bey on future plans of Turkey — Russia's interests in the Bosphorus and Asia Minor — Von Bülow on 1915 campaign in Mesopotamia — Quotations from Sir William Willcocks, Ellis Barker, Captain A. T. Mahan, Professor Rohrbach, Professor Seymour, Prince von Bülow, Count Reventlow.

CHAPTER III

TURKEY AND ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS FROM THE BOER WAR TO THE EUROPEAN WAR — 1899–1914 . 23

Joseph Chamberlain on alliances between England, the United States, and Germany — Lord Salisbury on Anglo-German friendliness — Fashoda and threatened war between France and England — Effects of Boer War on world opinion — Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 — Anglo-French Agreement in 1904, and Count Reventlow

thereon — The Kaiser's visits to Constantinople and the Holy Land, secures concessions for the Bagdad Railway — The Kaiser's visit to Tangier in 1905, reasons for, by Prince von Bülow — The Algeciras Conference of 1906 — Count Reventlow and Professor Seymour on the results of the Conference — Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 — Young Turk Revolution of 1908, Professor Seymour on results — Prince von Bülow on results of the Bosnian Crisis — King Edward's forebodings on account of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria — San Giuliano, Foreign Minister of Italy, compares crisis of 1908 with that of 1914 — Prince von Bülow on King Edward's visit to Berlin in 1909 — The Agadir Incident and Lloyd George's speech thereon — My interviews with Von Bethmann-Hollweg, April, 1916, and with Lord Haldane, August, 1916, on the Haldane Mission to Berlin, 1912 — British Foreign Office on Germany's demand for neutrality treaty — Von Bernhardi on this demand — Sir Edward Grey on England's peace policy — Anglo-German relations up to 1914 — Proposed Anglo-German Treaty of 1914 (now first published) — M. P. Price, Professor Rohrbach, Dr. Jaeckh, Sidney Low, and Von Bethmann-Hollweg on this proposed treaty — Baron Beyens on Franco-German Agreement of 1914.

CHAPTER IV

THE THIRTEEN DAYS FROM JULY 23 TO AUGUST 4, 1914 46

Extracts from diplomatic dispatches — E. J. Dillon on the Austro-Servian Crisis — My interviews with Count Tisza, Count and Countess Berchtold, Baron Burian, and others on Austria-Hungary's reasons for making war on Servia — Extracts from diplomatic documents on the Austro-Hungarian Crisis with Servia — Bismarck's story of how he manipulated the Ems Telegram and forced war in 1870 — Baron Beyens on war-threats of the German Emperor and of Von Moltke in 1913 — M. P. Price's analysis of Germany's position in 1914 — A. G. Gardiner on efforts of Von Bethmann-Hollweg and of Sir Edward Grey to prevent war in July, 1914 — G. Lowes Dickinson on Russia's previous mobilization.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER V

WHY DID ENGLAND ENTER THE WAR? 78

Cause of war remote from England — Captain Mahan on England's duty — Extracts from diplomatic dispatches — Letters between the President of the French Republic and King George of England — Austria immovable against Servia — Germany's misunderstanding of other nations — Germany averse to war — How Russia worked for peace — Sir Edward Grey's wise efforts to avert war.

CHAPTER VI

WHY DID GERMANY INVADE BELGIUM? . . . 102

Germany did not expect England's intervention — Speech of Senator Humbert, July 13, 1914, on France's unpreparedness — Incalculable advantages to Germany of advance through Belgium — Expectation of taking France on undefended frontier — Control gained of France's mineral resources — Petition of influential associations to German Government to take territory from France and to control Belgium after the war — What France lost through invasion — France strangled.

CHAPTER VII

THE SPOLIATION OF BELGIUM 114

Von Bethmann-Hollweg's speech of August 4, 1914, telling why Germany invaded Luxemburg and Belgium — Description of Belgium's wealth — German requisitions of raw materials and machinery and other materials — German theories of spoliation — Professor Massart on causes of famine in Belgium — Report of Dr. Rathenau and Dr. Ganghofer on how Belgium was stripped — Official orders for stripping Belgium — Removal of machinery from factories — Maeterlinck on Belgium's distress — Spread of tuberculosis — Baron Beyens on spirit of Belgium — Verhaeren on "Proud Belgium."

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VIII

THE SUBMARINE IN ITS RELATION TO RAIL POWER *versus* SEA POWER 133

Why Germany looks to submarine as surest weapon for success — Germany's rules of submarine warfare in force in April, 1916 — Captain Persius on submarine warfare — Dr. Flamm on submarine possibilities — Rail power *versus* sea power as exemplified in Russo-Japanese War — My interview with General Kuropatkin — E. A. Pratt, on "The Rise of Rail Power" — My interview with Herr Deutsch on Germany as self-supporting unit — Submarine murder at sea — Sinkings of Lusitania, Arabic, Ancona, Persia — Germany's warfare on merchantmen — Execution of Captain Fryatt — James Brown Scott on the legality of the execution — Germany's new submarine laws — "German Prize Law in its Latest Form," by Dr. Schramm — Letter in London "Times," July 16, 1914, by Sir Percy Scott, with extract from letter by a foreign naval officer, announcing a policy since followed by Germany.

CHAPTER IX

THE ZEPPELIN RAIDS IN ENGLAND 157

Results of comparison of German official reports of Zeppelin raids with actualities, in Liverpool, Birkenhead, Manchester, London, Grimsby — German illustrated book on Zeppelin raids — German belief in Zeppelin fables — Effects on England of Zeppelin raids.

CHAPTER X

THE GERMAN ARMY IN BELGIUM ACCORDING TO GERMAN DOCUMENTS 171

German doctrine of war as explained in extracts from Clausewitz, Von Hartmann, Captain Walter Bloem, and German General Staff — Proclamations, notices, and letters addressed by German army officers to Belgian cities and villages — Address to population of Munster, August 29, 1914, by General von Bissing.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XI

ALLEGED ATROCITIES OF THE GERMAN TROOPS IN BELGIUM 180

Facts accepted by Germany as well as by France and England —

1. The Belgian allegations —

Statements by Cardinal Mercier — Professor L. H. Grondys, a Dutchman of Dordrecht, on destruction at Louvain (a personal narrative) — Execution of a priest — Extracts from Gustave Somville's Book, "The Road to Liège," a narrative of personal observations at the time of the invasion — Extracts from notebooks of German soldiers and officers — Extracts from "Belgians under the German Eagle," by Professor Jean Massart — Story by South American Priest in Belgium — "The Helpless Victims," a letter to the "New York Times," by an American woman.

2. Germany's defense —

Statement by Dr. Alfred Zimmermann — Appeal to civilized world by ninety-three professors of German universities.

CHAPTER XII

ALLEGED ATROCITIES ON THE GERMAN TROOPS BY CIVILIANS IN BELGIUM 212

1. The German allegations —

Extracts from the German White Book on Louvain, Dinant, Aerschot, and other places — What German children are taught regarding the invasion of Belgium — Emperor William's telegram to President Wilson — Von Bethmann-Hollweg's statement to the press of New York.

2. Belgium's defense —

Report of work of the Pax Society — Belgium Freemasons demand investigation under neutral auspices — Cardinal Mercier makes same demand — Letters of Bishops of Belgium to Bishops of Germany, Bavaria, and Austria-Hungary, denying charges and demanding neutral investigation — German Government always refuses investigation — What religious interests demand — Violation of international law in Belgium continues.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XIII

EXTRACTS FROM THE HAGUE CONVENTIONS OF 1907 232

Selections from agreements made at The Hague by Germany and nearly all the other powers of the world — These selections apply to acts of Germany in Belgium.

CHAPTER XIV

THE NEUTRALITY OF BELGIUM 237

1. Early history —
   Statements of Von Moltke — Karl Hildebrand, Bismarck, David Jayne Hill.
2. The German case against Belgium —
   Von Bethmann-Hollweg in 1914 — Dr. Dernburg's defense of Germany in 1914 — Statements of Von Jagow and of German Minister of War in 1913 — Treaty between Germany and Great Britain in 1870 — Gladstone's speech on treaty in 1870 — Stowell on Gladstone's speech — Study of documents found by Germany in 1914 in Archives of Belgian Government — King Albert's statement in "New York World," March 22, 1915.
3. Side-lights on Belgian Diplomacy, 1905 to 1914 —
   Statement by German Foreign Office — Correctness of Belgium's attitude indicated by Baron Beyens, April 24, 1914, and by Baron Greindl, 1911 — Diplomatic documents on neutrality of Belgium.
4. The Tragic Prelude —
   Germany's note to Belgium — Belgium's reply to Germany's demand — King Albert asks King George for England's diplomatic aid — Belgium, invaded, appeals to guarantors of neutrality — Germany's course — Refusal during years to define intentions — August 4, 1914, war declared — King Albert's address to Belgian Parliament — Heroic dispatch to Belgian Foreign Ministers in all lands.
5. Statements of Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin —
   Relations of Kaiser Wilhelm II and King Albert — Early hints of war — Plans of German Staff unfathomed

by prophets — Days just before the invasion — Diplomatic letters and conversations — Kaiser and Chancellor address the Reichstag.

6. Germany's charges at beginning of the war —
   Statements published September, 1914, signed by many leading Germans — Investigation of these allegations by two distinguished French professors — Course of France indicated by orders of Joffre and Messimy.
7. The innocence of Belgium —
   German war plans discussed in "Deutsche Kriege Zeitung" — Germany's strategic railways — Plan of campaign dates back to the elder von Moltke — German Intelligence Department badly informed.

CHAPTER XV

THE GERMAN THEORIES AND PRACTICE OF DEPORTATIONS AND OF TERRITORIAL APPROPRIATION . 295

1. Origin of theories —
   Importance of natural safety to a dominant nation — Germany in nineteenth century.
2. Mission of German people and their sense of superiority —
   Baron von Stengel on Germany's gift of peace to all the world — Opinions of Professors Eucken and Östwald, of the Kaiser, of Von der Goltz, Dr. Lasson, and others — The German God.
3. Inferiority of other nations —
   Feeling against England expressed by Meyer and Rohrbach.
4. Germany's policies for expansion and methods to be employed —
   Views of Lagarde, Wagner, Lange, Tannenberg, Frymann — Proposed peace terms with France — Wolff on policy of conquerors — Rohrbach on small states — Tannenberg's Greater Germany.
5. The Belgian deportations —
   Descriptions by Boulger and Cardinal Mercier — Appeal to America from Holland — Stoddard Dewey — Belgian Syndicalist Committee — Municipal Council of Brussels — Women of France — Elihu Root.
6. The spoliation of Poland —
   German "Import Company, Ltd." — Starvation and

deportation reports from "Nowa Reforma," "Journal de Genève," "Lodzianin " — Statement of Von Hindenberg — Explanation of German theories of requisition by Von Hartmann.

7. Deportations from Lille and other French cities —
Report by French Government — Proclamation of German authorities — Protests of Mayor and of Bishops of Lille — Letters from victims — Letter to the President of the French Republic.

8. The German state of mind —
Its causes — Effect on public opinion by use of poisonous gases and burning liquids — Refusal of Turks to use liquid fire — Destruction of monuments justified by General von Disfurth — Mistaken methods of Germany — Effect in England of executions of Captain Fryatt and of Edith Cavell — Effect of deportations in England and France — Individual liberty *versus* state dominance.

8. Mass psychology —
German machinery of unification — Results in Belgium and Poland — Root quoted — Two illustrations of the German psychology: Attempted embroilment of Japan and Mexico with United States; charge of Zimmermann of United States "plot" against Germany.

CHAPTER XVI

ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN FRANCE 352

Extracts from French Official Report — Treatment of civil population — Crimes against women and girls — Shooting of prisoners — Massacre at Nomeny — Two days of massacre at Gerbéviller — Sister Julie's testimony — That of Professor Morgan — Story of "Day of Honor," September 24, 1914, by German officer, Klempt, in "Jauersches Tageblatt" — Stephen Pichon on "Martyrs of Alsace and Lorraine."

CHAPTER XVII

ALLEGED ATROCITIES BY THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS IN EAST PRUSSIA 364

The Kaiser's message to President Wilson — Story of Cossack invasion of Bearskin District. Atrocities during

first Russian invasion, from German Official Records — Harsh war levies and treatment of hostages — Story of woman from Borszymmen — Deportations to Siberia — Summary.

CHAPTER XVIII

ALLEGED GERMAN ATROCITIES AGAINST THE RUSSIANS 371

Russian official report of German treatment of Russian envoys and their families departing from Berlin — Treatment of consuls — Departing distinguished visitors arrested as "prisoners of war" — Conditions of travel of departing Russians, women and children, aged and invalids, chiefly from German health resorts — Russians treated as common criminals — Arrest of Mr. Shébéko, Member of Imperial Council, and outrage on Countess Worontzoff-Dachkoff, wife of the Vice-Regent of the Caucasus — Despoiling of invalids in German and Austrian health resorts — Regions devastated on withdrawal of German troops from Russian Poland — German atrocities investigated by Extraordinary Commission appointed on initiative of Russian State Duma — The Germans in Czenstochow — Riches stolen from monastery of Iasnogor — Poignant story of Mlle. Hélène S., who escaped to Petrograd.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TRAGEDY OF ARMENIA: THE TURKISH METHODS OF SPOLIATION, DEPORTATION AND MASSACRE . 390

A million and a half people robbed, tortured, driven from home — Half of them perish under appalling atrocities and cruelty — "Turkey for the Turks" new idea of rulers — Talaat Bey's estimate of number of expelled Armenians — Turkish methods unparalleled in history — Story of eighteen thousand exiles in one caravan — Armenian colleges established by Americans — Professors and students arrested, tortured and murdered — Mamouret-ul-Aziz in 1915 — At Aleppo — In Marash —

Results of deportations in certain provinces — A million deported from six provinces and not one Armenian left — Armenian soldiers massacred — Women and children prisoners burned at Bitlis, Moush, and Sassoun — Victims outraged, mutilated, shot, drowned, and stabbed — Extracts from interview with Commissioner G. Gorrini, late Italian Consul-General at Trebizond — Proclamation commanding deportation by Turkish Government.

CHAPTER XX

ALLEGED AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN ATROCITIES IN SERVIA 405

Personal investigation by Professor R. A. Reiss, of University of Lausanne — Massacres of civilians by "bloodthirsty and Sadic brutes" — Sinking of Ancona related by Dr. Cecile Greil, American woman survivor — Over two hundred perished in this disaster.

CHAPTER XXI

ENGLAND 411

The feeling as to Germany — As to the navy — As to tariffs — As to labor and capital — As to France — As to terms of peace — Industrial reorganization — Woman's suffrage — Munition factories — New status of labor — The funeral of the crew of the Zeppelin that fell at Cuffly.

CHAPTER XXII

GERMANY 430

Feeling as the victim of a great conspiracy — Interviews with Herr Zimmermann — Von Bethmann-Hollweg — Visit to Professor Eucken — Belief as to submarine — Certainty of success.

CHAPTER XXIII

TURKEY 438

Journey to Constantinople — My interviews with the Grand Vizier and Talaat Bey — Comparison of Constan-

tinople to New Orleans — Russia and the Bosphorus — Germany's dream of the Orient — The fate of Egypt — The British Empire.

CHAPTER XXIV

OUR SISTER FRANCE — A TRIBUTE 458

CHAPTER XXV

THE LESSON TO OUR COUNTRY 464

Mexico the Turkey of the Western Hemisphere — Lincoln on our great possession — The foundations of the United States as laid by Jefferson and Monroe — Our dealings with the Barbary pirates — Our duty toward maintaining public right — Mr. Hoover's work in Belgium — Washington's words as to the law of nations.

CHAPTER XXVI

HEROIC VOICES 476

Letters from soldiers — Anecdotes of self-sacrifice — The women of Europe — Edith Cavell.

OBSTACLES TO PEACE

CHAPTER I

THE WORLD AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE discoveries in science, and their application, by organization, to the natural resources of the earth made a new world during the nineteenth century. It is difficult to overestimate the changes wrought by the railroad, steam, electricity, and the hundreds of other inventions and discoveries. Their most fateful result was the modification of the accidental relations of nations and populations to territory and access to the sea.

Japan has a population of 55,000,000, and its arable land has an area of about 20,000 square miles. If all the population of the United States and Canada were confined to the State of Iowa, each person would have as much arable land as is available to each inhabitant of Japan. Japan has unlimited access to the sea.

Russia is larger than North America, and it is estimated that by the end of the century it will have nearly half a billion inhabitants. With proper cultivation it could produce enough food to supply the world, but its access to the chief markets of the world is by the Baltic and the Bosphorus. If the United States were in the same condition her people could reach the sea only by the St. Lawrence River and the Gulf of

Mexico, with both routes liable to be closed in time of war.

Germany, a trifle larger than the State of California, has two thirds the population of the United States. Her access to the sea is limited to her northwestern borders, and can be denied in time of war. The vital interests of Germany demand a military establishment sufficiently strong so that with her allies she can resist successfully any possible combination of enemies.

The British Empire consists of the Islands of Great Britain and Ireland (whose population largely depends on sea-borne commerce; the United Kingdom would perish if cut off from food imports by sea) and several small nations, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, and numerous dependencies and colonies, like India and Egypt, and other possessions in Africa and elsewhere. No single unit composing the British Empire, except the United Kingdom, could successfully resist a powerful aggressor. Their safety depends on union with England, and the safety of England and the various component parts of the British Empire can last only so long as Great Britain possesses an enormous mercantile marine, and a navy that will with her allies absolutely protect this mercantile marine against any possible hostile combination of navies.

Of all the nations in the world the United States is the most fortunately situated. She possesses enormous territory, has no dangerous neighbors, and has unlimited access to the sea. This access to the sea, combined with a highly organized and adequate railway system, enables her easily to reach the markets of the world. With a sufficient navy, and an army small compared

with the armies of European countries, and a proper policy toward Mexico, the United States would be the safest nation in the world. It is a continent in area and an island in defensibility.

The French Revolution is the most potent event in the last hundred and fifty years. It was the prime cause of universal military service in Europe. It introduced the idea of universal suffrage. Above all, it intensified the sense of nationality.

The last half of the nineteenth century witnessed the creation of the Kingdom of Italy and of the German Empire. The creation of these two nations still further intensified the feeling of nationality.

Germany has been very fortunate in a sequence of great statesmen, as well as in leaders in science, social organization, industry, and commerce. Her poets, philosophers, historians, composers, enriched her national life and intensified the national feeling. All the world knows of the unparalleled efficiency of the social and industrial organization of Germany.

The bounds of the territory of Germany were established and could not well be enlarged in Europe. The passionate sense of national self-consciousness, as well as need of new fields for industrial exploitation, forced Germany to seek "a place in the sun." This movement was backed by an enormous propaganda, which aroused anxiety and hostility in the neighboring states.

An atmosphere of mutual hostility was produced between England and Germany on account of the rapid development of the German navy. The hostility between France and Germany was kept alive partly by the Alsace-Lorraine question and partly by collisions on various other questions; and early in the

present century the interests of Germany and Russia became more and more antagonistic on account of Germany's ambitions in Turkey.

The potential causes of the war are dealt with in the next two chapters, which also tell of the agreement between Germany, France, and England. This agreement would likely have brought peace for generations to the nations of Europe, had it not been for the immediate cause of the war, — the assassination of the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary.

The principal effort of Germany for expansion was in Asiatic Turkey. This field which Germany sought I will describe in my next chapter.

CHAPTER II

ASIATIC TURKEY: THE BAGDAD RAILWAY

HOWEVER difficult the various questions involved in the peace settlement, — and no one can exaggerate the almost insoluble questions, — the real problem of this war is Asiatic Turkey. The settlement of this question may involve a continuous series of devastating wars at longer or shorter intervals for generations.

From an economic standpoint the control of the resources and of the development of Asiatic Turkey is a vital necessity to Germany.

From a military standpoint the control of Asiatic Turkey by Germany would so shift the seats of power in the world as vitally to threaten the very existence of the British Empire.

If there can be found no other alternative than the control of this territory, either by Germany and her allies, or by England and her allies, resulting in the one case in threatening the safety of the British Empire, and in the other in preventing German expansion, — wars and rumors of wars will dominate the twentieth century.

Here are the facts in this problem.

Asiatic Turkey as a field for German enterprise

Asiatic Turkey is almost one fourth as large as the United States, or about the size of Mexico. While it contains much desert territory, it also has very fertile

regions, and above all, great tracts of land that could be redeemed by irrigation.

In an address before the Khedival Geographical Society at Cairo, Sir William Willcocks, a famous engineer, who had surveyed the country and planned great irrigation works, said of Mesopotamia: —

We have before us the restoration of that ancient land whose name was a synonym for abundance, prosperity, and grandeur for many generations. Records as old as those of Egypt and as well attested tell of fertile lands and teeming populations, mighty kings and warriors, sages and wise men, over periods of thousands of years. And over and above everything else there is this unfailing record that the teeming wealth of this land was the goal of all Eastern conquerors and its possession the crown of their conquests. The Eastern Power which held this land in old historic days held the East. A land such as this is worth resuscitating. Once we have apprehended the true cause of its present desolate and abandoned condition, we are on our way to restoring it to its ancient fertility. A land which so readily responded to ancient science, and gave a return which sufficed for the maintenance of a Persian Court in all its splendor, will surely respond to the efforts of modern science and return manifold the money and talent spent on its regeneration. . . . Of all the regions of the earth, no region is more favored by nature for the production of cereals than the lands on the Tigris. Indeed, I have heard our former President, Dr. Schweinfurth, say, in this very hall, that wheat in its wild, uncultivated state has its home in these semi-arid regions and from here it has been transported to every quarter of the globe. Cotton, sugar-cane, Indian corn, and all the summer products of Egypt will flourish here as on the Nile, while the winter products of cereals, leguminous plants, Egyptian clover, opium, and tobacco will find themselves at home as they did in Egypt. Of the historic gardens of Babylon and Bagdad it is not necessary for me to speak. A land whose climate allows her to produce such crops in tropical profu-

sion, and whose snow-fed rivers permit of perennial irrigation over millions of acres, cannot be barren and desolate when the Bagdad Railway is traversing her fields and European capital is seeking there a remunerative outlet.

Asiatic Turkey was famous in antiquity for its agricultural wealth. Agriculture was the basis of the vast wealth of Babylonia, Assyria, Lydia, Media, Phœnicia, which had occupied what is now Asiatic Turkey.

In my interview with H. E. Ahmed Nessimi Bey, Minister of Agriculture, Commerce, and Mines of the Imperial Ottoman Empire, I made particular inquiries as to the agricultural and mineral wealth of Turkey. The replies I received were the result of several weeks of investigation largely by German experts.

Coal mines are very abundant and rich. Arganis copper mines are the biggest and richest in the world. Mesopotamia forms the richest petroleum district in the world. The country is extremely rich in minerals, including gold, silver, nickel, mercury, lead, and these resources are untouched.

The undeveloped agricultural and mineral wealth of a country nearly one fourth as large as the United States would furnish to Germany a new and great realm and give her a place in the sun that could utilize her force and genius for many generations. Just as the mineral wealth of Alsace-Lorraine is the basis of Germany's industrial development, so the possession of Asiatic Turkey is absolutely essential for Germany's expansion.

Asiatic Turkey is the land of the Bible. In a brilliant study of this marvelous land in the "Nineteenth Century" for June, 1916, J. Ellis Barker writes as follows: —

Mesopotamia has almost unlimited agricultural possibilities. Babylonia and Assyria were the cradle of Christian civilization and perhaps of mankind. Chapter II, verse 8, of Genesis tells us: "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed." The word "Eden" is the Sumerian word, as Assyriologists have told us, for "plain." The ancient Babylonians also had a myth of a great plain in the center of which stood the Tree of Knowledge, and they possessed likewise the story of the Flood and of the Ark. In Genesis, chapter II, verse 14, we read in the description of Paradise: "And the name of the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates." Assyriologists tell us that the four rivers mentioned in the Bible were the Euphrates and Tigris, and two of the huge artificial canals which the ancients had constructed. In chapter X of Genesis we are made acquainted with Nimrod, Babel, Erech, Accad, Calneh, Nineveh, and other Babylonian names. Ur, on the Euphrates near Babylon, was the birthplace of Abraham. The ancient Jews placed their Paradise in Eden because Eden, the Mesopotamian plain, was then the garden of the world. Herodotus, who had visited Mesopotamia and the town of Babylon, and who wrote about the year 450 B.C., has told us — the translation is Rawlinson's: "The whole of Babylonia is, like Egypt, intersected with canals. The largest of them all, which runs towards the winter sun, and is impassable except in boats, is carried from the Euphrates into another stream, called the Tigris, the river upon which the town of Nineveh formerly stood. Of all the countries that we know, there is none which is so fruitful in grain. It makes no pretension, indeed, of growing the fig, the olive, the vine, or any other tree of the kind, but in grain it is so fruitful as to yield commonly two hundredfold. The blade of the wheat plant and barley plant is often four fingers in breadth. As for the millet and the sesame, I shall not say to what height they grow, though within my own knowledge, for I am not ignorant that what I have already written concerning the fruitfulness of Babylonia must seem incred-

ible to those who have never visited the country. The whole country under the domination of the Persians, besides paying a fixed tribute, is parceled out into divisions to supply food to the Great King and his army. Now, out of the twelve months of the year, the district of Babylon furnished food during four; the other regions of Asia during eight; by which it appears that Assyria, in respect of resources, is one third the whole of Asia."

Apparently Mesopotamia was at the time almost twice as wealthy as Egypt. According to the ancient writers, the fruitfulness of Babylonia exceeded that of Egypt. Assyria and Babylonia were the wealthiest countries of antiquity, and Mesopotamia was the richest part of the great Persian Empire. Persia's wealth was chiefly Babylonian wealth. In the Middle Ages, Bagdad arose among the Babylonian ruins, and between the tenth and eleventh centuries it had 2,000,000 inhabitants, 60,000 baths, 80,000 bazaars, etc. It was the capital of the gigantic Arab Empire, the wealth of which was founded upon the flourishing agriculture of the Babylonian plain.

In olden times Babylonia was perfectly irrigated. Under the Turks, the wonderful system of canals fell into neglect. The Babylonian plain became partly a desert and partly a swamp. Mesopotamia, which, in olden times, was the most densely populated part of the world, is at present the most sparsely peopled part of the Turkish Empire. All Mesopotamia has at present only two million inhabitants, or fourteen people per square mile, and it could support thirty million people.

European diplomacy for ten years and the chief causes of this war have to do with the questions involved in Asiatic Turkey. Asiatic Turkey is a natural, almost uninvadable fortress, but a fortress that is self-sustaining as to food and military supplies. While

Asiatic Turkey has the natural resources to support an enormous population, and while its relation between the three continents, Europe, Asia, and Africa, gives it a strategic position that cannot be overrated, it must be understood that in itself it is very easily defended. Its land frontiers are protected by vast waterless deserts or lofty mountain ranges. Its water frontiers, the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, complete its boundaries, so as to give it the advantage of being an island.

It is the seat of power to control the Mohammedan world. Whatever may be in the minds of the statesmen of Europe, it may safely be said that all other questions involved in the great war are minor compared to the future of Asiatic Turkey.

Quite recently both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Sazonov have stated definitely that Russia and England have agreed as to all the questions involved in the Near East, including their respective intentions as to Asiatic Turkey.

In the "Nineteenth Century" for June, 1916, Ellis Barker continues: —

> Asiatic Turkey is a natural fortress which possesses vast possibilities for attack, for it borders upon some of the most valuable and most vulnerable positions in the world, and it is able to dominate them and to seize them by a surprise attack. In the north it can threaten the rich Caucasian provinces of Russia and their oil fields, with Tiflis, Batum, Baku. From its six hundred miles of Black Sea coast it can attack the rich Russian Black Sea provinces, with the Crimea, Odessa, Nikolaeff, and Kherson. It can easily strike across the narrow Bosphorus at Constantinople. Toward the west of Asia Minor, and in easy reach of it, lie the beautiful Greek and Italian islands in the Ægean,

which until recently belonged to Turkey, and lies Greece itself, which for centuries was a Turkish possession. West of Turkish Syria lie the Suez Canal, Egypt, Erythea, and the Italian and French colonies of North Africa.

A powerful Asiatic Turkey can obviously dominate not only the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and the Suez Canal, but the very narrow entrance of the Red Sea near Aden, and that of the Persian Gulf near Muscat, as well. It must also not be forgotten that only a comparatively short distance, a stretch of country under the nominal rule of weak and decadent Persia, separates Asiatic Turkey from the Indian frontier. It is clear that Asiatic Turkey, lying in the center of the old world, is at the same time a natural fortress of the greatest defensive strength and an ideal base for a surprise attack upon southern Russia, Constantinople, the Ægean Islands, Greece, the Suez Canal, Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan, and India.

Asiatic Turkey is economically very important, not only because it is possible to increase enormously its stunted power of production, but also because, with the building of railways, an enormous passenger and goods traffic may be developed on the direct line which connects Central Europe with India and China via Asia Minor. The intercourse between East and West is rapidly increasing. The Suez Canal traffic came in 1870 to 436,609 tons net. In 1876 it came to 2,096,771 tons, in 1882 to 5,074,808 tons, in 1901 to 10,823,-840, and in 1912 to 20,275,120 tons net. The geographical position of Asia Minor on the shortest trade route connecting the East with the West, which gave wealth to Phœnicia, and which made Sidon and Tyre the merchants of the ancient world and the founders of a far-flung sea-empire, may greatly enrich its inhabitants.

What a fundamental change in the strategical position of this region might imply for Great Britain was well expressed by so eminent and impartial an authority as A. T. Mahan, when he said, in his "Retrospect and Prospect" (1902): —

The control of the Persian Gulf by a foreign state of considerable naval potentiality, a "fleet in being" there, based upon a strong military port, would reproduce the relations of Cadiz, Gibraltar, and Malta to the Mediterranean. It would flank all the routes to the Farther East, to India and to Australia, the last two actually internal to the Empire, regarded as a political system; and, although at present Great Britain unquestionably could check such a fleet, it might well require a detachment large enough to affect seriously the general strength of her naval position. . . . Concessions in the Persian Gulf, whether by positive formal arrangement, or by simple neglect of the local commercial interests which now underlie political and military control, will imperil Great Britain's naval situation in the Farther East, her political position in India, her commercial interests in both, and the Imperial tie between herself and Australia.

The "Times Current History" (vol. VI, p. 731) reprints a short article by Dr. Paul Rohrbach, entitled "On the Road to India." Dr. Rohrbach says in part:

By getting control of Egypt, England, on the one hand, greatly strengthened her position as a world-power, but, on the other hand, she made herself vulnerable on land. It was supposed before that England's weak spot, her tendon of Achilles, was India. But after she proved during the Boer War that she could transport an army of hundreds of thousands of men over great distances by sea, and keep them supplied, the probability waned of a Russian attack on India. Russia could hardly transport over the difficult mountain roads of the Pamirs and Afghanistan the number of men required for overrunning India, even if she had at the outset the sympathies of a part of the natives.

But it is otherwise with Egypt. From the earliest days to which we can go back in history, the rulers of Egypt, from the first of the Pharaohs, have, on account of the geographical peculiarities of the frontier between Asia and Africa, always tried to strengthen their hold on their dominions by getting control of the territories lying on the other side of the

Isthmus of Suez — Palestine and Syria. And strong Asiatic empires, for their part, who numbered Syria among their provinces, have coveted Egypt. As soon as England acquired Egypt it was incumbent upon her to guard against any menace from Asia. Such a danger apparently arose when Turkey, weakened by her last war with Russia and by difficult conditions at home, began to turn to Germany for support.

And now war has come and England is reaping the crops which she has sown. England, not we, desired this war. She knows this, despite all her hypocritical talk, and she fears that, as soon as connection is established along the Berlin-Vienna-Budapest-Sofia-Constantinople line, the fate of Egypt may be decided. Through the Suez Canal goes the route to all the lands surrounding the Indian Ocean, and, by way of Singapore, to the western shores of the Pacific. These two worlds together have about 900,000,000 inhabitants, more than half the population of the universe, and India lies in a controlling position in their midst. Should England lose the Suez Canal, she will be obliged, unlike the powers in control of that waterway, to use the long route around the Cape of Good Hope and depend on the good-will of the South African Boers. The majority among the latter have not the same views as Botha.

The Socialist "Leipziger Volkszeitung" declared in March, 1911, that "the new situation shortly to be created in Asia Minor would hasten the break-up of the British Empire, which was already beginning to totter."

In "Die Neue Zeit" for June 2, 1911, Herr Karl Radek said: —

The strengthening of German Imperialism, the first success of which, attained with so much effort, is the Bagdad Railway; the victory of the revolutionary party in Turkey; the prospect of a modern revolutionary movement in India, which, of course, must be regarded as a very different thing

from the earlier scattered risings of industrial tribes; the movement toward nationalization in Egypt; the beginning of reform in Egypt;—all this has raised to an extraordinary degree the political significance of the Bagdad Railway question.

The Bagdad Railway being a blow at the interests of English Imperialism, Turkey could entrust its construction only to the German company, because she knew that Germany's army and navy stood behind her, which fact makes it appear to England and Russia inadvisable to exert too sensitive a pressure upon Turkey.

In the "Akademische Blätter" of June 1, 1911, Professor R. Mangelsdorf, another recognized authority on German policy and politics, wrote:—

The political and military power an organized railway system will confer upon Turkey is altogether in the interest of Germany, which can obtain a share in actual economic developments only if Turkey is independent; and, besides, any attempt to increase the power and ambition of England, in any case oppressively great, is thereby effectively thwarted. To some extent, indeed, Turkey's construction of a railway system is a threat to England, for it means that an attack on the most vulnerable part of the body of England's world-empire, namely, Egypt, comes well within the bounds of possibility.

Professor Charles Seymour, of Yale University, in his accurate and comprehensive book, "The Diplomatic Background of the War," says:—

The Bagdad Railway was designed so as to connect Haldar Pasha, one of the Asiatic suburbs of Constantinople, with one of the harbors conceded to Germany on the Persian Gulf.

The railway was to follow the route of Cyrus and the Ten Thousand in the "Anabasis," over the Taurus and down into the plains of Mesopotamia. Two branch railways of the

utmost importance were secured by the German company: the one was the most direct trade route to Smyrna; the other gave connection with the port of Alexandretta. Furthermore, the Germans later obtained the concession of the line planned to run between Aleppo, Damascus, and Mecca, the route which would naturally be taken by all Moslem pilgrims. Even the Holy Land will radiate from Mecca to Constantinople, and from Smyrna to the Persian Gulf. One terminus will be within twelve hours of Egypt, another terminus will be within four days of Bombay.

The constitution of the Bagdad Railway Company may be said to be an event of the first importance in the history of European diplomacy. It was the first step in Germany's southeastern policy which was designed to win for German traders complete economic control over the Turkish dominions and ultimately, possibly, a political protectorate; Germany was to "add to her sway the ancient empire of Semiramis and Nebuchadnezzar, of Cyrus and Haroun al Raschid." Asia Minor and Mesopotamia are districts which have been among the most prosperous and productive in the whole world.

If Germany was to carry her Mesopotamian and Turkish policy to success, another aspect of the Near Eastern question concerned her very closely, namely, the position of the independent Balkan States. Should those nations become powerful and diplomatically autonomous the security of the path from Germany to Constantinople would be threatened. They must, therefore, be subjected to the domination of Germany, or better still, to that of Germany's ally, Austria; for Austria has always had greater success than Germany in dealing with the Slavs. In no event could the Slavs be allowed to control the Balkans, lest Germany's communications with Asia Minor be cut. Thus, a regenerated Turkey must guard the Straits while Austria dominated the Balkans. With her ally, Austria, supreme on the Danube, and her friend, Turkey, in control of the Dardanelles, Germany might reasonably hope to be master of a sweep of territory extending from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. She would cut Russia from her Mediterranean trade, hold the

shortest route to the East, and threaten the position of the British in Egypt and India.

Asiatic Turkey dominates the three continents of the Eastern Hemisphere where live ninety per cent of the human race. In control of its resources, economic and military, Germany would become the dominating world-power. It is the center of the Mohammedan world, and Pan-Islamism, supported by Germany, would get a new lease of life.

The Turks have gifts neither for government nor for industrial organization; Turkey can exist only as a vassal ally of some other power. Some other power, or powers, will inevitably dominate and develop this most valuable region, valuable largely because the control of Asiatic Turkey means a long step toward world-power. Germany and Turkey are at present in close economic and military alliance.

Of especial interest, therefore, was my interview with Talaat Bey, the dictator of Turkey. He impressed me as a man of absolute force, of tremendous energy and executive ability. The picture of Turkey and Islamism as seen to-day by the Turks never before has seemed so promising. Turkey is no longer the Sick Man of Europe, but a people young, energetic, ambitious. This impression I received from Talaat Bey.

After two long interviews with this distinguished man, I submitted to him, in writing, a series of questions. These questions were answered after careful coöperation with the heads of the Turkish Government, aided by experts. The document thus prepared was sent to the Turkish Embassy in Berlin, thence to the German Foreign Office, and after several days'

deliberation was finally given to me intact, in writing, in English, just as it had left the hands of Talaat Bey. Its statements were as follows: —

Knowing that railways are the basis of all kinds of economic, industrial, commercial, as well as agricultural progress, and seeing that our present railways are not sufficient for our military and commercial purposes, we intend to build a complete network of railways over all parts of the country. All big cities will be joined to the different seaports. Thus our mineral, agricultural, and industrial products will have an easy exit to the outer world. Up till now railway concessions have been used by certain powers as political weapons against independence. Now we are fighting for a complete independence and for national existence; and, wishing to be masters of our domain, we intend to buy all railways as soon as opportunities arise.

Egypt is an autonomous vilayet of the Ottoman empire; Egypt will have all the rights bestowed on her of self-government with a constitution. It will be the same to our empire as Hungary to Austria.

Tripoli was a part of our empire which was captured in a pirate manner by Italy. Italy having not handed over our islands on one side and declaring war on the other side, we count our treaty with her as nil and will make Tripoli another Egypt under the rule of Sheikh Senussi.

Tunis shall also be made like Egypt or Tripoli.

Algiers, Morocco, and Sahara being Moslem land, we want to free them from the foreign yoke if it shall be possible; otherwise, we will do our best to insure their national, social, and religious rights, and by so doing lessen their sufferings.

Persia being a sister country and natural ally of Turkey, we wish to see her independent, strong, prosperous, and progressive. We will help her by all possible means and do our best to protect her rights and integrity.

India being an eastern country and having more than 80,000,000 of Moslems, we wish to see her independent, prosperous, regaining her old glories. We are doing our best

to insure to this country all national, religious, political freedom and aspiration.

We want to put our empire on the same footing as any other European power in regard to military, educational, industrial, and, more than anything else, moral progress.

The progress of Islam in Africa is a natural phenomenon, showing the vitality of Islam. It is done without any missionary effort. It emancipates the ignorant people from the darkness of brutality to civilization. Our Sheik-ul-Islam will be doing humanity a great good and a great service to Islam if he will form a missionary body to propagandize Islam in Africa and turn the heathen into true believers.

These were no empty words; they expressed the assured policy of Turkey, strengthened by her economic and military alliance with Germany and her allies.

The interests of Russia in regard to the Bosphorus and Asia Minor are antagonistic to those of Germany and Turkey. Germany's splendid dream of an Eastern Empire demands the control of the route from Berlin, through Constantinople to Basra. With the development of the wheat-fields in the Black Sea region it is a vital necessity for Russia to control Constantinople and the Bosphorus. I asked Professor Rohrbach, who is the great authority on matters involving Russia and Germany, how it would be possible to safeguard Russia's interests with Germany in control of the Bosphorus. He replied very clearly that the interests of Germany and Russia were so opposed to each other that it was impossible to meet the needs of both, and that inasmuch as German civilization was superior to Russian civilization Russia's interests must be sacrificed, rather than Germany's.

In his book on "The Bagdad Railway" (Berlin,

1911), Professor Rohrbach summarized its military and political possibilities as follows: —

A direct attack upon England across the North Sea is out of the question; the prospect of a German invasion of England is a fantastic dream. It is necessary to discover another combination in order to hit England in a vulnerable spot — *and here we come to the point where the relationship of Germany to Turkey, and the conditions prevailing in Turkey, become of decisive importance for German foreign policy, based as it now is upon watchfulness in the direction of England.* . . . England can be attacked and mortally wounded by land from Europe only in one place, — Egypt. The loss of Egypt would mean for England not only the end of her dominion over the Suez Canal and of her connections with India and the Far East, but would probably entail the loss also of her possessions in Central and East Africa. The conquest of Egypt by a Mohammedan power like Turkey would also imperil England's hold over her sixty million Mohammedan subjects in India, besides prejudicing her relations with Afghanistan and Persia. Turkey, however, can never dream of recovering Egypt until she is mistress of a developed railway system in Asia Minor and Syria, and until, through the progress of the Anatolian Railway to Bagdad, she is in a position to withstand an attack by England upon Mesopotamia. . . . The stronger Turkey grows, the more dangerous does she become for England. . . . Egypt is a prize which for Turkey would be well worth the risk of taking sides with Germany in a war with England. *The policy of protecting Turkey, which is now pursued by Germany, has no other object but the desire to effect an insurance against the danger of a war with England.*

Now, with the exception of one or two breaks, which will soon be finished, there is a direct connection from Berlin, through Constantinople, by rail, almost to the Suez Canal and to Bagdad.

In his new edition of "Imperial Germany" Prince

von Bülow, ex-Chancellor of the German Empire, says:—

The Bagdad Railway scheme was a result of the Emperor's journey to Palestine in 1898, a very few months after the first Navy Bill was passed, and this was in every respect successful. It threw open to German influence and German enterprise a field of activity between the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf, on the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and along their banks, which can hardly be surpassed for fertility and for its great possibilities of development in the future. The Bagdad Railway has already proved to be of military value, for it enabled Turkey to send reinforcements to Mesopotamia in time to stop the English on their march to Bagdad, and to inflict sensible defeats upon them. After eighteen months the English have not yet succeeded in entering Bagdad. "Ce ne sont pas seulement les forces turques opérant en Mésopotamie qui se ravitaillent par cette voie," was the plaint of the "Temps" after the first English reverse at Kut-el-Amara; "mais toute action turco-allemande en Perse repose sur cette communication, qui relie Constantinople à Ispahan." The Bagdad Railway also restores the route by which trade from Europe to India and from India to Europe once passed. By means of a rational irrigation of the districts through which it passes, this territory can once more be made the paradise it was in ancient times. If one can speak of boundless prospects anywhere, it is in Mesopotamia, not only on account of the Mesopotamian oil-fields, which for the most part lie near the Bagdad Railway, but in every respect.

One of the most curious things about German literature of the last ten or fifteen years is the frank revelation of policies calculated to alarm other nations. Thus several military writers of high authority mentioned the plan of invading France by way of Belgium. I quote a very suggestive statement by Count Revent-

low, who in "Deutschlands Auswärtige Politik" (3d edition, p. 340) says: —

> It had an unfavorable effect, and created difficulties, that in Germany itself the object and the importance of the Bagdad Railway was proclaimed to the world to some extent in an incorrect and a very exaggerated manner. As early as the beginning of the new century people talked openly, with a triumph which far anticipated events, of the railway which would threaten India and render possible a Turkish invasion of Egypt. A German war station would arise on the Persian Gulf, and the superfluous German population would be settled in Mesopotamia. In this direction we have made great mistakes through ill-advised methods of propaganda. The more quietly the Bagdad Railway was built the better. It was certainly true that it would be possible, after the network of railways had been completed, to make of Turkey a dangerous menace against Egypt and India; but that sort of thing ought not to have been said so long as Great Britain still was in a position to hinder and to delay the building of the railway.

Just as the enormous physical resources of the United States plus the inventions of the nineteenth century rendered possible such hitherto unimagined corporations as the Standard Oil Company, the United States Steel Corporation, and further rendered it possible for a comparatively small group of men to dominate the world of finance and industry, so these same inventions plus the enormous natural resources of the Eastern Hemisphere bring within the sphere of practical politics colossal combinations of nations undreamed of fifty years ago. The German dream of world-dominance would be largely realized by an alliance of the powers from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf (including also Salonika). Germany leads the

world in agriculture. East of Austria agriculture is primitive. Therefore, in land cultivation, as well as in the application of modern science and methods to other natural resources, there are the greatest imaginable possibilities for development. As the world existed in 1914 there was nothing impossible in this dream of world-dominion.

Germany's Turkish policy during the last ten years before the war had changed the face of European diplomacy. I will study this matter in my next chapter.

CHAPTER III

TURKEY AND ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS FROM THE BOER WAR TO THE EUROPEAN WAR 1899–1914

THE years from 1899 to 1914 witnessed a greater revolution in the diplomatic relations of the great powers of Europe than any other period in modern history. The main causes of this change were the interests of England, Germany, and Russia in Asiatic Turkey.

At the opening of the twentieth century the relations between England and France and England and Russia were unsettled and troublous. The relations between England and Germany during the nineteenth century were mainly friendly. Up to 1914 it was true that England and Germany were probably the only two great European powers who had never shed a drop of each other's blood.

Joseph Chamberlain in a public speech had suggested an alliance between England, the United States, and Germany. In an address in the Guildhall in 1899, Lord Salisbury said: —

> This morning you have learned of the arrangement concluded between us and one of the Continental States, with whom more than with others we have for years maintained sympathetic and friendly relations. The arrangement is above all interesting as an indication that our relations with the German nation are all that we could desire.

In 1898 England and France were on the verge of war over the Fashoda affair. In that year, after four-

teen years of preparation, Kitchener had reconquered the Soudan which had been overrun and devastated by the Mahdi. When he reached Fashoda, on the Upper Nile, he found Lieutenant Marchand with a French expedition in possession. If France had confirmed her conquest of the Upper Nile, it would have been a serious disaster to England's African enterprise. This caused a dangerous crisis that brought France and England to the verge of war.

France was very bitter after diplomacy had decided in Great Britain's favor, and during the Boer War (which began October, 1899) there was in France a press campaign directed against Great Britain as bitter as any in the belligerent press of to-day. The press in Germany was almost as bitter as the French press. England was amazed and appalled at the hostility of public opinion expressed by the newspapers in nearly all countries, including the United States.

As one result of the situation produced by the Boer War, England made an alliance with Japan, January 30, 1902. This was to safeguard her imperial interests in the East.

The South African problems were settled in such a fashion as to make the Union of South Africa one of the most loyal of the self-governing nations of the British Empire.

In 1904 England and France composed their differences, — largely colonial. The main provisions of this treaty of April 30, 1904, dealt with Egypt and Morocco. France withdrew her opposition to England's occupation of Egypt, and England withdrew her opposing claims to Morocco.

But while this treaty led to a friendship that was

almost an alliance between England and France, it caused great hostility between England and Germany.

Count Reventlow, in his last book, "The Vampire of the Continent," gives Germany's feeling in these words: —

> The understanding between France and England was an event of the highest importance in the history of the world. The convention of 1904 put an end, once and for all, to all the colonial quarrels between England and France. The work of liquidation, begun in 1899, was finished five years later. Bismarck had understood, by a skillful handling of African colonial problems, how to prevent a *rapprochement* between the two Western Powers; especially had he understood the art of keeping the Egyptian question — that chief bone of contention — alive. Fourteen years after Bismarck's departure, the last seeds of dissension sowed by this policy of his were dug up and destroyed.

I will now trace another cause of the divergence of English and German interests.

Germany's Asiatic dream

Bismarck's mind was filled with his life-work. He had organized the German Empire; he had nationalized the railways. Besides taking from France territory which quadrupled the iron-ore production of Germany, he had taken one billion dollars in cash. He had little interest in the Balkans or the East. His great achievement had exhausted or fulfilled his passion for aggrandizement.

The present Emperor brought a fresh and vigorous mind to Germany's needs and growth. Within a year and a half of his accession to the Imperial throne, he paid his first visit to a European capital and to a

European sovereign. The capital was Constantinople; the sovereign was Abdul Hamid.

Nine years later, in 1898, the German Emperor made his second visit to Constantinople, a voyage which included Palestine and visits to Jerusalem and Damascus. One result of these visits was the securing of concessions that led to the Bagdad Railway.

The German Emperor had the vision of Alexander and Napoleon. He was to found a great empire in the East. Marschall von Bieberstein, the ablest diplomat not only of Germany but of Europe, represented Germany in Turkey. Germany became the dominating European power in Turkey. The foundations for a great Eastern Empire were well and successfully laid by Germany.

England's treaty with France aroused Germany, who saw her interests in Morocco menaced and above all her prestige in the Mohammedan world. This led to the German Emperor's voyage to Tangier in 1905. The effect of Russia's defeat at the hands of Japan was now felt in the west of Europe. France's great Eastern ally was out of the ring indefinitely.

The importance of the Emperor's voyage in relation to Asiatic Turkey is clearly explained by Prince von Bülow, as follows: —

In November, 1898, the Emperor William II had said in Damascus: "The three hundred million Mohammedans who live scattered over the globe may be assured of this, that the German Emperor will be their friend at all times." In Tangier the Emperor had declared emphatically in favor of the integrity of Morocco. We should have completely destroyed our credit in the Mohammedan world, if so soon after these declarations we had sold Morocco to the French. Our Ambassador in Constantinople, Freiherr von Marschall,

said to me at the time: "If we sacrifice Morocco in spite of Damascus and Tangier, we shall at one fell swoop lose our position in Turkey and therefore all advantages and prospects that we have painfully acquired by the labor of many years."

As I have shown, the advantages and prospects in Asiatic Turkey were regarded as utterly vital to Germany.

Germany had dreams also of a great African Empire, but her chief preoccupation was Asiatic Turkey, and the voyage of Emperor Wilhelm II to Morocco, which to many seemed spectacular, was, as Von Bülow explains, largely in behalf of Germany's Asiatic projects.

The result of this voyage to Morocco was the Algeciras Conference of 1906, the outcome of which is described somewhat bitterly by Count Reventlow in his new book, "The Vampire of the Continent": —

All the demands of the German representatives at the Algeciras Conference were rejected, and not a single Power was to be found to back up Germany energetically. Germany's isolation was so complete that she was thankful to Austria-Hungary when the latter's representatives declared themselves ready, in one particularly knotty question, to build a bridge over which the Germans could effect an honorable retreat. The Algeciras Act, a very voluminous document, was from beginning to end a complete farce.

The Italians were also to be found at Algeciras among Germany's adversaries; the same was the case with nearly all the smaller European States, and with the United States of America. This was a phenomenon, the importance of which completely overshadowed that of the Moroccan question taken by itself. With extraordinary skill, rapidity, and energy, England's statesmen had understood how suddenly to represent the German Empire as the disturber of European peace, as a danger to France, and as jealous of Great Britain.

Professor Seymour summarizes the results of the Algeciras Conference in these words: —

> On none of the crucial issues discussed during the Conference of Algeciras did Germany receive the support of the other Powers. . . .
>
> And by a curious irony, Germany in demanding the Conference of Algeciras had brought English and Russian representatives together upon a common ground, and thus paved the way for the Anglo-Russian accord.

This leads us to the Anglo-Russian treaty of 1907.

In a sense Russia touches the interests of nearly all nations in Europe and Asia. Russia impends over Sweden, Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Balkans, Constantinople and the Bosphorus, Asia Minor, and the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, Persia, India, China, and Japan. England's foreign policy for a century has been largely determined by India. And she feared Russian aggression against India.

On August 31, 1907, a treaty between England and Russia was signed which removed their rivalries in regard to the long-pending question involving their mutual interests in Afghanistan, Persia, Thibet, and brought about an *entente*.

The Bosnian Crisis of 1908

We now come to the so-called Bosnian crisis of 1908.

By the famous Treaty of Berlin of 1878, Bosnia and Herzegovina, while remaining provinces of the Turkish Empire, were occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary. The change in the Balkans by the success of the Young Turks is thus described by Professor Seymour: —

In 1908 came the Young Turk Revolution, which led Austria to a fateful step. The Young Turks aimed above everything at a regeneration of their country's foreign policy and especially at a strengthening of Turkish power in the Balkans. Austria and Germany favored a strong government at Constantinople, since Turkey was guarding the Dardanelles in their interests. But a Turkey predominant in the whole Balkan Peninsula was undesirable, for it would threaten Austria's road to the Adriatic and Ægean. Furthermore, it seemed likely that the Young Turks would not hesitate to demand the termination of Austrian administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina; the provinces legally belonged to Turkey, and if the new Government should prove its capacity, the Porte would have every right again to assume direct administration over them.

Austria-Hungary annexed the two provinces. This interfered with the ambitions of Servia; it also strengthened the influence of Germany and Austria in the Balkans, and to that extent interfered with the influence of Russia in the Balkans. Whichever group of nations controls the Balkans has the dominance in Turkey.

Further, it was a direct breach of a treaty made by all Europe. The effect of this treaty violation was far-reaching. Russia protested vigorously, but not yet having recovered from the military disasters of her war with Japan, she could not enforce her demands, although strongly supported by France and England. This was the first conflict between the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. Germany's position is clearly told by Prince von Bülow in his book, "Imperial Germany": —

> The final annexation by Austria-Hungary of the Provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which, in accordance with the decisions of the Berlin Congress, Austria had occupied since 1878, led to a great European crisis. . . .

In my speeches in the Reichstag I made it quite clear that Germany was resolved to preserve her alliance with Austria at any cost. The German sword had been thrown into the scale of European decision, directly in support of our Austro-Hungarian ally, indirectly for the preservation of European peace, and above all for the sake of German credit and the maintenance of our position in the world.

Lord Redesdale, in his recently published memoirs, speaks of the effect on King Edward. Lord Redesdale happened to be at Balmoral when the news of the Austrian annexations in the Balkans reached the King. "No one who was there can forget," he said, "how terribly he was upset. Never did I see him so moved. . . . Every word that he uttered that day has come true."

There is a great similarity between the Bosnian crisis of 1908 and the Servian crisis of 1914 which caused the war. It seems to me that Austria-Hungary expected the crisis of 1914 to take the course of the Bosnian crisis of 1908.

E. J. Dillon, chief correspondent of the London "Telegraph," tells of the views of San Giuliano, Foreign Minister of Italy in the Servian crisis in 1914:—

He virtually said to his two foreign colleagues: "Your policy takes account of two alternatives and does not cover the whole ground of eventualities. You fancy that you may succeed in imposing your will on Servia to-day as you did during the Bosnian crisis, and that if you fail in this the worst that can happen is that Russia will take Servia's part and you will have only those to deal with. In the former case you will have exalted your horn greatly and won a brilliant diplomatic success; in the latter you will gather military laurels with ease and certainty. Pray let me assure you that you are making a miscalculation. Your reading of the international situation, which has changed fundamentally during these few years, is erroneous. The Entente Powers are no

longer in the mood to brook arbitrary acts and they will oppose you resolutely. Russia will certainly take Servia's part, and, what is more to the point, France will stand by Russia. And if France is involved in the war Britain will not leave her in the lurch."

In 1909, King Edward VII visited Berlin. I can give no higher authority as to the German idea of this visit, its purposes and effects, than by quoting the words of Prince von Bülow, then German Chancellor. He said: —

In the winter of 1909, immediately after the Bosnian crisis had taken a decisive turn, King Edward VII paid a visit to the German Emperor and Empress in Berlin. This visit passed off in a satisfactory manner, and the King had a hearty reception. He, for his part, succeeded in emphasizing the favorable impression made by his visit, by repeatedly giving expression to his sincere love of peace and his warm friendship, sentiments which found corroboration soon after in the Speech from the Throne and the Debate on the Address in the English Parliament. This last visit of King Edward VII aroused good hope for the future and shed a pleasant light, not only on the personal relations of the King with Germany, but also on those between two great nations who have every reason to respect one another, and to vie with each other amicably in the work of peace. Reactions might, of course, set in. In point of fact they did. Indeed, the reaction in the summer of 1911 was somewhat violent. But the attempt to extend the opposition between England and Germany into a system of combined international policy, will hardly be repeated, and, if it should be, it will once more be foiled by the hard facts of Continental politics, of which the very hardest is the Triple Alliance.

Prince von Bülow refers to the Agadir incident of 1911 when the Panther, a small gunboat, suddenly appeared on the west coast of Morocco, at the port of

Agadir. This reopened the Morocco question. England at this time strongly supported France, and Lloyd George, in a speech at the Mansion House, warned Germany that in this matter she must reckon with England. The Morocco question was settled. Germany and France each made concessions. But certain bitternesses were aroused in Germany.

The Haldane Mission of 1912

Still an effort was made to heal the breach between England and Germany.

In my interview with Von Bethmann-Hollweg, in Berlin, April, 1916, he spoke with considerable fullness of Lord Haldane's visit and the effort to make a lasting agreement between Germany and England. And in August, 1916, I had a long interview with Lord Haldane on the same subject. This was the most important attempt up to that time to secure permanently friendly relations between the two countries. In a recently published book on Lord Haldane, a chapter is devoted to his visit to Berlin.

The author informs us that Lord Haldane has read the proofs of this particular chapter and has commented upon it thus: "In no point is it inaccurate." As the narrative is in many details new and is given to the world on the highest authority I shall quote it at some length: —

> After the Agadir incident and Mr. Lloyd George's strong speech at the Mansion House, the Kaiser sent a private message to one of our ministers — not Lord Haldane — by a personal friend in England, suggesting that the two Cabinets should confer.
>
> Instead of using the ordinary means of diplomatic com-

munication, which might have deepened the Kaiser's suspicions and appeared in the nature of a rebuff, the Government most wisely decided to send a minister who spoke the German language very perfectly, who was perfectly acquainted with the Kaiser and his chief ministers, and who was also well informed as to the working of the British Foreign Office. Lord Haldane was chosen for this most difficult mission, and after Sir Edward Goschen, the British Ambassador in Berlin, had come over here to discuss matters, Lord Haldane, ostensibly as a private citizen interested in education, set out for Germany.

Lord Haldane arrived in Berlin on February 8, 1912. That same morning he had a private conversation at the British Embassy with the German Chancellor. On the next day he saw the German Emperor and Admiral von Tirpitz together. And on the third day he saw the Chancellor again.

The purpose of this embassy, as we know now, was to ascertain why good relations between the two countries had become overclouded, and to assure the German Government that the British policy of good-will which had characterized King Edward's reign still persisted.

It is understood that in his opening conversation with the Chancellor, Lord Haldane established a most friendly confidence, Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg declaring with absolute truth that for two and a half years the aim of his policy had been to come to some agreement with England.

Lord Haldane made it perfectly plain to the Chancellor that the Triple Alliance had given Germany tremendous strength, and that any increase in her fighting forces was a very serious matter for other powers. So far as we know, Lord Haldane did not question Germany's right to increase her armaments, but it is known that he asked the Chancellor to consider whether an increase in the German navy, which must unquestionably be met by a double increase in the British navy, could facilitate friendly relations. The whole course of his negotiations turned on that point. The Chancellor made a tentative proposal on the subject, a proposal to see how far he could go in making an offer to spread German shipbuilding over a number of years; in the mean time

he referred to a particular proposal on the question of British and German action in the event of war which he had already made to the British Government.

This proposal, we now know, was a formula of absolute neutrality, which bound both parties not to enter into any combination against each other. Lord Haldane pointed out the obvious objections to the wording of this formula, and suggested the British Government's alternative of mutual undertakings against all combinations, military and naval agreements, and plans directed to the purpose of aggression and unprovoked attack. The Chancellor was not satisfied with the extent of this counter-proposal.

Lord Haldane's conversations took place on the basis that his first duty as representing the Government here was to make it plain that he could only speak on the footing that absolute loyalty to the *ententes* with France and Russia must be the condition of any further progress toward an understanding with the German Government. He went on to say that we could not be reckoned on as neutrals if France were attacked or if the neutrality of Belgium were violated. He also insisted that if Germany entered on a policy of increasing her naval development we should lay down two keels to every one she laid down.

When shortly afterwards she proceeded to introduce a new Fleet Law, this course was at once adopted, as a reference to the British Naval Estimates, which were increased from thirty-six millions to fifty-one, and as the discussions in Parliament show.

The most authoritative statement as to Lord Haldane's mission is the one issued September 1, 1915, by the British Foreign Office, from which I quote as follows: —

Early in 1912 the German Chancellor sketched to Lord Haldane the following formula as one which would meet the views of the Imperial Government: —

1. The high contracting parties assure each other mutually of their desire of peace and friendship.

2. They will not either of them make or prepare to make any (unprovoked) attack upon the other, or join in any combination or design against the other for purposes of aggression, or become party to any plan or naval or military enterprise alone or in combination with any other power directed to such an end, and declare not to be bound by any such engagement.

3. If either of the high contracting parties becomes entangled in a war with one or more powers in which it cannot be said to be the aggressor, the other party will at least observe toward the power so entangled a benevolent neutrality, and will use its utmost endeavor for the localization of the conflict. If either of the high contracting parties is forced to go to war by obvious provocation from a third party, they bind themselves to enter into an exchange of views concerning their attitude in such a conflict.

4. The duty of neutrality which rises out of the preceding article has no application in so far as it may not be reconcilable with existing agreements which the high contracting parties have already made.

5. The making of new agreements which render it impossible for either of the parties to observe neutrality toward the other beyond what is provided by the preceding limitation is excluded in conformity with the provisions in article 2.

6. The high contracting parties declare that they will do all in their power to prevent differences and misunderstandings arising between either of them and other powers.

These conditions, although in appearance fair as between the parties, would have been grossly unfair and one-sided in their operation. Owing to the general position of the European powers, and the treaty engagements by which they were bound, the result of articles 4 and 5 would have been that, while Germany in the case of a European conflict would have remained free to support her friends, England would have been forbidden to raise a finger in defense of hers.

Germany could arrange without difficulty that the formal inception of hostilities should rest with Austria. If Austria and Russia were at war, Germany would support Austria,

as is evident from what occurred at the end of July, 1914; while as soon as Russia was attacked by two powers, France was bound to come to her assistance. In other words, the pledge of neutrality offered by Germany would have been absolutely valueless, because she could always plead the necessity of fulfilling her existing obligations under the Triple Alliance, as an excuse for departing from neutrality. On the other hand, no such departure, however serious the provocation, would have been possible for England, which was bound by no alliances with the exception of those with Japan and Portugal, while the making of fresh alliances was prohibited by article 5. In a word, as appeared still more evident later, there was to be a guarantee of absolute neutrality on one side, but not on the other.

It was impossible for us to enter into a contract so obviously inequitable, and the formula was accordingly rejected by Sir E. Grey.

I quote so fully because the negotiation was a most important effort on the part of two peace-loving statesmen, Sir Edward Grey and Von Bethmann-Hollweg, to come to an agreement.

A very clear exposition of Germany's views is given by Von Bernhardi ("Britain as Germany's Vassal," by Friedrich von Bernhardi, pp. 152–55):—

England would have to give Germany an absolutely free hand in all questions touching European politics, and agree beforehand to any increase of Germany's power on the Continent of Europe which may ensue from the formation of a Central European Union of Powers, or from a German war with France. England would have to agree that she would no longer strive to prevent by her diplomacy the expansion of Germany's colonial empire as long as such development would not take place at England's cost. She would further have to agree to any possible change of the map of North Africa that might take place in Germany's or Italy's favor. England would further have to bind herself that she would

not hinder Austria's expansion in the Balkan Peninsula. She would have to offer no opposition to Germany's economic expansion in Asia Minor, and she would have to make up her mind that she would no longer oppose the development of Germany's sea power by the acquisition of coaling-stations.

As the concessions enumerated in the foregoing would in no case involve a material sacrifice on England's part, but would only mean the unconditional acknowledgment and benevolent support of Germany's natural development, Germany, on her part, would be able to bind herself that she would give equally benevolent and energetic support in promoting England's interests.

It must remain an open question whether such an understanding should take the form of an alliance. By its nature it would be equivalent to an alliance, and on the basis of such an understanding England and Germany could peacefully arrange their economic interests throughout the world. Such an agreement would create an irresistible force, which would necessarily promote the development of both nations. It would create a civilizing factor which would advance human progress. It would go a long way to banish war, and the fear of war, or would at least diminish its dangers. If England in this way approaches the Triple Alliance, European peace would be assured, and a powerful counterpoise would be created to the growing influence of the United States.

The effect of such an agreement as Germany wanted can easily be realized by studying the present war.

When the German armies intrenched after the battle of the Marne, France had lost the greater part of her coal and iron. Unless she could import coal, iron and steel, France could not maintain her industries or manufacture more than a negligible amount of ammunition. Without England's sea power France would have been conquered in three months.

The brief glance I have given to European diplomacy during the nineteenth century shows a series of disagreements between England and Germany, with frequent efforts toward friendly relations.

Speaking of England's treaties of 1904 with France and in 1907 with Russia, Sir Edward Grey said in an interview given to the Chicago "Daily News," April 10, 1916, in answer to this question: —

Should you mind indicating the object of Britain's *rapprochements* in recent years?

Good relations and an end to quarrels with other powers. Going far back, we had working relations with the Triple Alliance, but we were habitually in friction with France or Russia. Again and again it brought us to the verge of war, and so we decided to come to an arrangement with France and then with Russia, not with any hostile intent toward Germany or any other power, but wholly to pave the way to permanent peace. So, instead of preparing for war, as Germany asserts without a vestige of truth to support the assertion, we were endeavoring to avoid war and not to make it.

It is impossible here to discuss the Balkan wars. Following Italy's war against Turkey, beginning September 27, 1911, ending with the Treaty of Lausanne, October 15, 1912, a union of the Balkan States was formed against Turkey. Montenegro opened the war, October 8, 1912. After the Balkan States had fought a victorious war with Turkey, they fought among themselves. This inter-Balkan war was settled by the Treaty of Bucharest, August 6, 1913.

I will now discuss the relations of England and Germany up to June, 1914.

Although the Haldane mission had failed, the relations between England and Germany had greatly im-

proved during the Balkan wars. There remained, however, the very serious question of the Bagdad Railway and Asiatic Turkey.

Professor Price, of the University of Cambridge, England, in his book "The Diplomatic History of the War" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), makes this statement: —

> But in spite of the failure of the political and naval negotiations, in spite of the Morocco crisis and the ever-increasing pressure of armaments, Anglo-German relations sensibly improved after the Balkan crisis of 1912, when the two countries coöperated for the settlement of the Albanian question. It appeared, in fact, about this time that a change in Anglo-German relations was about to take place on account of mutual interests in the Near East. Indeed, an Anglo-German agreement over spheres of influence in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia was being prepared and was to have been signed in the autumn of 1914. Such an agreement would have settled all outstanding questions between the two countries in the East, it would have given Germany her place in the sun, and might have laid the seed of an understanding in Europe which would have included Germany in a European concert and put an end to the system of power-balances.

Just what is meant by the very definite statement of Price? He must have had very definite knowledge to have declared in terms so positive that the crucial question of Asia Minor was being settled.

Dr. Paul Rohrbach, in "Der Krieg und die deutsche Politik" (p. 85), says: —

> Now that everything has been changed, it may be safely said [*kann man ruhig sagen*] that the negotiations with England about the delimitation of our spheres of interest in the East and in Africa had been brought to a close and signed [i.e., I suppose, initialed by the negotiators], and that the

only remaining question was as to their publication. In Africa, English policy had gone a surprisingly long way to meet us. In Turkey, not only had large concessions been made to the German point of view on the question of the Bagdad Railway, but the other matters connected with this, the working of the Mesopotamian petroleum-fields and the navigation of the Tigris, which England had hitherto had in her sole possession, were regulated along with German participation.

Now, Dr. Rohrbach is one of the very best-informed men in Germany on all Eastern questions.

The Anglo-German Treaty of 1914

By a mere chance I learned the terms of this treaty, or agreement, which was initialed by the negotiators representing England and Germany in June, 1914, and was to have been signed in the autumn of 1914. On my way to Constantinople in the Balkanzug I was introduced by my friend and traveling companion, Professor von Schultze Gävernitz, to Dr. Jaeckh, an expert on Turkish affairs, who had been private secretary to Von Kiderlen-Wächter. He had helped in the preparation of the treaty, and he gave me its terms. I took the statement he gave me to the German Foreign Office in Berlin. Certain slight corrections were made. I publish herewith the document exactly as I got it from Dr. Zimmermann, now the Foreign Minister of the Imperial German Government. It settled the disputes between England and Germany, just as the treaties of 1904 and 1907 had settled the long-standing and war-provoking disputes between England and France and England and Russia.

Sir Edward Grey had now completed his series of great agreements, and the German Government had

demonstrated its pacific character. It would seem that this treaty would have secured the peace of Europe for generations.

Terms of the Anglo-German Agreement of 1914

Anglo-German agreement, 1914, which was drafted and already initialed by the members of the conference. It would have satisfied Germany for decades without endangering the British Empire: —

1. The Bagdad Railway from Constantinople to Basra is definitely left to German capital in coöperation with Turkey. In the territory of the Bagdad Railway German economical working will not be hindered by England.

2. Basra becomes a sea harbor in the building of which German capital is concerned with 60 per cent and English capital with 40 per cent. For the navigation from Basra to the Persian Gulf the independence of the open sea is agreed to.

3. Kuweit is excluded from the agreement between Germany and England.

4. In the navigation of the Tigris, English capital is interested with 50 per cent, German capital with 25 per cent, and Turkish with 25 per cent.

5. The oil-wells of the whole of Mesopotamia shall be developed by a British company, the capital of which shall be given at 50 per cent by England, at 25 per cent by the German Bank, at 25 per cent by the "Royal Dutch Company" (a company which is Dutch, but closely connected with England). For the irrigation works there had been intended a similar understanding. The rights of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, in which, as is known, the English Government is concerned, remained unaffected. This society exercises south of Basra, on the Schatel-Arabia, as well as in all south and central Persia, a monopoly on the production and transport of oil.

6. A simultaneous German-French agreement leaves free hand to French capital for the construction of railways in southern Syria and Palestine.

Besides this, there is an agreement, already made before, between Germany and England, concerning Africa, with a repartition of their spheres of influence in Angola and Mozambique.

Finally there is to be mentioned the Morocco agreement, which established the political predominance of France in Morocco, but, on the other hand, stated the principle of "open door" to the trade of all nations.

Referring to this treaty Sidney Low, in a review of the new edition of Prince von Bülow's "Imperial Germany," in the "Fortnightly Review" for December, 1916, says: —

In the summer of 1914, shortly before the outbreak of the Great War, a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and Germany by which the Near Eastern ambitions of the former power were recognized (and, as it would seem, endorsed) to their full extent by the latter. Prince von Bülow points out that the conclusion of the Bagdad Railway Treaty sets the seal on one of the great achievements in German world-policy. The text of this remarkable treaty has not been made public; but its general purport is known, and it is known also that the German interests are treated with amazing generosity. "Germany," says Rohrbach, "was given concessions in the matter of the Bagdad Railway, the Mesopotamian petroleum springs, and the Tigris navigation, which *exceeded all expectations*." In point of fact, Germany, without any war, would have secured a virtual control of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, and a predominant opportunity for pacific penetration in the whole territory between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf.

And Von Bethmann-Hollweg, in his speech in the Reichstag, December 2, 1914, in reference to this agreement, said: —

The crisis of 1911 gave a new impetus to the negotiations. The English people suddenly realized that they had stood

at the brink of a European war. Popular sentiment forced the British Government to a *rapprochement* with Germany. After long and arduous negotiations we finally arrived at an understanding on various disputed questions of an economic character, regarding Africa and Asia Minor. This understanding was to lessen every possible political friction. The world is wide. There is room enough for both nations to measure their strength in peaceful rivalry as long as our national strength is allowed free scope for development.

The German Foreign Office published a collection of the dispatches to the Belgian Government from the Belgian Ministers at London, Paris, and Berlin. These dispatches were found in the archives of the Belgian Government. Among them is one from Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin, dated February 20, 1914, and dealing with this treaty. I quote the dispatch in full: —

Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin, to M. Davignon, Minister of Foreign Affairs

Berlin, February 20, 1914,

Sir: —

The Franco-German agreement concerning Asia Minor, concluded very recently at Berlin after difficult negotiations and thanks to the personal intervention of the Chancellor, assures to France a large sphere of action and influence in Syria. She will be able to build a railway line starting from Beiroot along the valley of the Orontes, back of the Anti-Lebanon as far as Aleppo, the point of junction with the German lines. Another French line, also starting from Beiroot, passing through Homs, will reach the Euphrates in the direction of the 35th parallel. M. Cambon showed me on the map these lines which are not yet known to the public. The coast of the Mediterranean between Alexandretta and Beiroot will be neutralized; no railway can be built there either by Germany or by France, be it along the coast or

across the Anti-Lebanon. A line of this sort was not considered necessary. It would arouse the hostility of the fanatic tribes of the Anti-Lebanon who close their country to Europeans and carry the products of the soil, the chief one of which is tobacco, to the harbor of Latakia themselves. The difficulty of the negotiations consisted principally in the exact delimitation of the French and German zones of influence (60 kilometers on each side of the railway), so as to prevent them from overlapping. In addition to this, France retains the railway concessions which she obtained from Turkey in the rich mineral district of ancient Cappadocia, along the Black Sea, and the very profitable railway of Smyrna and Cassaba.

This is a very illuminating document. It greatly increases our knowledge of the agreements of 1914 between France and Germany in regard to Asiatic Turkey.

I give the treaty of June 1914 just as I received it from the German Foreign Office. Assuming that it would have been duly signed by the two Governments we may discuss its value as a solution of the problem of Asiatic Turkey.

England's interest in Egypt and the Suez Canal was protected by the French occupation of Palestine and southern Syria. Her interests in the Persian Gulf were protected by her occupation of Kuweit.

To a mere observer it would seem that some such agreement, that would also contain provisions to care for Russia's interests, would be a wise solution at the close of this war for the problem of Asiatic Turkey.

Had such a treaty been consummated, the ten years 1904 to 1914 would have been signalized by a series of treaties made between Great Britain and the great

Continental powers that would have removed nearly all the causes of friction in Europe.

I have made little reference to the hostile feeling aroused in England and Germany by naval rivalries, partly because Germany's naval policy was simply a factor in her policy of expansion and partly because this rivalry is a matter of general knowledge, while less is known of the effect of Germany's Asiatic policy in the relations of the European powers.

With these agreements between Germany on the one hand, and England and France on the other, what caused the war?

In my next chapter I will deal with the cause of the war that startled the world in August, 1914.

CHAPTER IV

THE THIRTEEN DAYS FROM JULY 23 TO AUGUST 4 1914

THE colonial and naval policy of Germany had caused periods of extreme tension between England and Germany, and for more than ten years before the present war broke out possibility and probability of war between these powers were openly discussed. A period of critical stress was caused by the Balkan Wars, when the conflicting interests of England and Germany might well have led to war. But the two countries had become less hostile to each other, and although the Haldane mission of 1912 was fruitless, good feeling and mutual confidence had worked out a solution of the fundamental problem of the Bagdad Railway and Asiatic Turkey.

The collaboration of England and Germany during the Balkan Wars had established relations of mutual confidence with a considerable degree of friendliness.

In April, 1913 Von Bethmann-Hollweg said in the Reichstag: —

> With England we are on the best footing; we have gone hand in hand with her in the present crisis, and in spite of Great Britain's membership in the Triple Entente, it is very advisable to aim at a peaceful agreement with the British Empire in the future. The language of the British statesmen is altogether conciliatory and peaceable.

We have confirmation of the growing *entente* between England and Germany in some dispatches sent by the

Belgian Minister at Berlin to his Government. These dispatches are in a Gray Book published by the German Government, containing dispatches from the Belgian Ministers at Berlin, London, and Paris from 1905 to 1914, and discovered by the German authorities in the archives of the Belgian Government in Brussels. I refer to this book again and quote freely from it in my chapter on Belgian neutrality.

Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin to M. Davignon, Minister of Foreign Affairs. [*Belgium.*]

Berlin, October 18, 1912.

Sir: —

The first effect of the Balkan crisis has been to bring about a *rapprochement* between the Imperial Government and that of the Republic. The initiative which M. Poincaré personally took, with a view to reëstablishing peace, received the approval and even the praise of the German press. [Extract.]

Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin to M. Davignon, Minister of Foreign Affairs. [*Belgium.*]

Berlin, November 30, 1912.

Sir: —

On this point [as to the Balkans] the German policy is approaching that of England and France, both emphatically pacific. The German press has adopted a much more conciliatory tone toward Great Britain and particularly toward Sir Edward Grey. The relations between the German and the British Governments are better than they have been for a long time and, according to the assurance of the French Ambassador, a relaxation which greatly helps the maintenance of peace is also taking place between the Cabinets of Berlin and Paris. [Extract.]

Additional proof of the improvement in the relations of Germany and England is to be found in the dispatch

of Sir E. Goschen, British Ambassador in Berlin, who wrote on August 5, 1914, to Sir Edward Grey: —

I found the Chancellor very agitated. He said all his efforts in that direction had been rendered useless by this last terrible step, and the policy to which, as I knew, he had devoted himself since his accession to office had tumbled down like a house of cards.

As I was leaving he said that the blow of Great Britain joining Germany's enemies was all the greater that almost up to the last moment he and his Government had been working with us and supporting our efforts to maintain peace between Austria and Russia. I said that this was part of the tragedy that saw the two nations fall apart just at the moment when the relations between them had been more friendly and cordial than they had been for years.

This improvement in the relations between the two countries is referred to by Sir Edward Grey in a dispatch to Sir E. Goschen on July 30, 1914: —

And I will say this: If the peace of Europe can be preserved and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately. I have desired this and worked for it, as far as I could, through the last Balkan crisis, and Germany, having a corresponding object, our relations sensibly improved.

Any well-informed European statesman might well have said on the morning of June 28, 1914, that the outlook for peace in Europe was better than it had been for decades.

In 1870 the candidacy of the Prince of Hohenzollern for the throne of Spain was the immediate or at least ostensible cause of the Franco-Prussian War, and in

1914 the assassination of the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary was the immediate cause of the present war. The key to the diplomacy of the fatal thirteen days, July 23 to August 4, 1914, lies in the different methods employed respectively by the British and German Governments to maintain peace after the breach between Austria-Hungary and Servia.

Von Bethmann-Hollweg refused to interfere between Austria and Servia, and devoted all his efforts to keep the other powers out. The policy of Germany was identical with her policy in 1908 when Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. Sir Edward Grey, with a clearer and saner vision, realized from the start that the danger would be in restraining Russia, and at once, grasping the essential European interest in the Austro-Servian War, urged the only method that could have possibly prevented the war.

On July 24, in a dispatch to the British Embassy in Berlin, Sir Edward Grey said: —

> If the Austrian ultimatum to Servia did not lead to trouble between Austria and Russia I had no concern with it; I had heard nothing yet from St. Petersburg, but I was very apprehensive of the view Russia would take of the situation.

And on Saturday, the 25th, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed to the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg:

> The sudden, brusque, and peremptory character of the Austrian *démarche* makes it almost inevitable that in a very short time both Russia and Austria will have mobilized against each other. In this event, the only chance of peace, in my opinion, is for the other four powers to join in asking the Austrian and Russian Governments not to cross the frontier, and to give time for the four powers acting at Vienna and St. Petersburg to try and arrange matters. If

Germany will adopt this view, I feel strongly that France and ourselves should act upon it. Italy would no doubt gladly coöperate.

No diplomatic intervention or meditation would be tolerated by either Russia or Austria unless it was clearly impartial and included the allies or friends of both. The cooperation of Germany would, therefore, be essential.

And to the British Embassy in Berlin, July 25: —

Apparently we should now soon be face to face with the mobilization of Austria and Russia. The only chance of peace, if this did happen, would be for Germany, France, Italy, and ourselves to keep together, and to join in asking Austria and Russia not to cross the frontier till we had had time to try and arrange matters between them.

Finally, on July 29, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed to the British Ambassador at Berlin: —

The German Government had said that they were favorable in principle to mediation between Russia and Austria if necessary. They seemed to think the particular method of conference, consultation, or discussion, or even conversation *à quatre* in London, too formal a method. I urged that the German Government should suggest any method by which the influence of the four powers could be used together to prevent war between Austria and Russia. France agreed, Italy agreed. The whole idea of mediation or mediating influence was ready to be put into operation by any method that Germany could suggest if mine was not acceptable. In fact, mediation was ready to come into operation by any method that Germany thought possible if only Germany would "press the button" in the interests of peace.

Already on Friday, July 24, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed the British Ambassador at Vienna: —

In the ensuing conversation with His Excellency, the Austrian Ambassador, I remarked that it seemed to me a matter for great regret that a time limit, and such a short

one at that, had been insisted upon at this stage of the proceedings. The murder of the Archduke and some of the circumstances respecting Servia quoted in a note aroused sympathy with Austria. . . . I added that I felt great apprehension, and that I should concern myself with the matter simply and solely from the point of view of the peace of Europe. The merits of the dispute between Austria and Servia were not the concern of His Majesty's Government, and such comments, as I had made above, were not made in order to discuss those merits.

As events have unfortunately proved, Sir Edward Grey's plan was the only one that could have saved Europe. For this reason there is a general belief that Germany failed to "press the button" because she wanted war. But neither the circumstances nor the available documents justify such a conclusion, at least so far as the German Government and the masses of the German people are concerned. Time alone will show whether or not the military party in Germany wanted war. I deal only with available material. So far as I have been able to get material from personal interviews and documents, it seems clear that the German Government did not want war. One may criticize the method employed which was to localize the Austro-Servian War, and not to regard the war as a matter of concern to Europe.

The exact difference between the viewpoint of the English and German Governments as to how to prevent war is to be found in the dispatch from Berlin of Sir E. Goschen (the British Ambassador) to Sir Edward Grey, on July 28: —

At the invitation of Imperial Chancellor, I called upon His Excellency this evening. He said that he wished me to tell you that he was most anxious that Germany should

work together with England for maintenance of general peace, as they had done successfully in the last European crisis. He had not been able to accept your proposal for a conference of representatives of the great powers, because he did not think that it would be effective, and because such a conference would in his opinion have had appearance of an "Areopagus" consisting of two powers of each group sitting in judgment upon the two remaining powers; but his inability to accept proposed conference must not be regarded as militating against his strong desire for effective coöperation. I ventured to say that if Austria refused to take any notice of Servian note, which, to my mind, gave way in nearly every point demanded by Austria, and which in any case offered a basis for discussion, surely a certain portion of responsibility would rest with her. His Excellency said that he did not wish to discuss the Servian note, but that Austria's standpoint, and in this he agreed, was that her quarrel with Servia was a purely Austrian concern with which Russia had nothing to do. He reiterated his desire to coöperate with England and his intention to do his utmost to maintain general peace. "A war between the great powers must be avoided," were his last words.

The trouble was that Austria felt secure in her course.

The exact position of Austria-Hungary and Germany is expressed in a dispatch from Count Szogyeny, the Austrian Ambassador at Berlin, to Count Berchtold, as follows: —

Berlin, July 28, 1914.

The proposal for mediation made by Great Britain, that Germany, Italy, Great Britain, and France should meet at a conference at London, is declined so far as Germany is concerned on the ground that it is impossible for Germany to bring her Ally before a European Court in her settlement with Servia.

On the 28th of July Von Bethmann-Hollweg sent a

dispatch to the Governments of Germany, which concluded in these words: —

Our own interest therefore calls us to the side of Austria-Hungary. . . .

Should, however, against our hope, through the interference of Russia, the fire be spread, we should have to support, faithful to our duty as allies, the neighbor-monarchy with all the power at our command.

It soon appeared, however, that the course of affairs would not follow that of the Bosnian crisis of 1908, and that Russia would insist on interfering if Austria attacked Servia. This led to a dispatch from Von Bethmann-Hollweg, that does not appear in the German White Book. It was revealed in a debate in the Reichstag November 9, 1916, by Von Bethmann-Hollweg, and is as follows: —

Von Bethmann-Hollweg to Count Berchtold

Berlin, July 30, 1914.

Should the Austro-Hungarian Government refuse all mediation, we should be confronted with a world-conflagration in which England would go against us, and Italy and Rumania, by all indications, would not be with us; so that with Austria-Hungary we should be facing three great powers. Germany, as a result of England's hostility, would have to bear the chief brunt of the fight.

The political prestige of Austria-Hungary, the honor of her arms, and her justified claims against Servia can be sufficiently safeguarded by the occupation of Belgrade or other places. We therefore urgently and emphatically ask the Vienna Cabinet to consider the acceptance of mediation on the proposed conditions.

This dispatch caused a sensation in Germany when it was made known.

On Thursday, July 30, Von Bethmann-Hollweg saw the situation substantially as Sir Edward Grey had seen it on Saturday, July 25. The loss of these five critical days was fatal.

On July 30, Von Bethmann-Hollweg telegraphed to the German Ambassador at Vienna as follows: —

Berlin, July 30, 1914.

We are indeed ready to fulfill our duty. As an ally we must, however, refuse to be drawn into a world-conflagration through Austria-Hungary not respecting our advice. Your Excellency will express this to Count Berchtold with all emphasis and great seriousness.

In the German White Book occurs this statement as to England's policy: —

Shoulder to shoulder with England, we labored incessantly, and supported every proposal in Vienna from which we hoped to gain the possibility of a peaceable solution of the conflict. We even, as late as the 30th of July, forwarded the English proposal to Vienna, as basis for negotiations, that Austria-Hungary should dictate her conditions in Servia, i.e., after her march into Servia.

And on August 4, 1914, before the Reichstag, Von Bethmann-Hollweg said: —

Russia has set fire to the building. We are at war with Russia and France — a war that has been forced upon us. . . . From the first moment of the Austro-Servian conflict we declared that this question must be limited to Austria-Hungary and Servia, and we worked with this end in view. All Governments, especially that of Great Britain, took the same attitude. Russia alone asserted that she had to be heard in the settlement of this matter.

Few students of the war, or writers of books on the war, have paid much attention to the efforts for mu-

tual understanding between England and Germany. This has led German writers into a field of absurdities in their endeavor to charge England with the guilt of the war. The same is true of the writers of books hostile to Germany. For that reason I have described somewhat fully the Haldane visit to Germany in 1912, and have also referred to the growing friendliness between the two countries during the Balkan Wars. I have given the terms of the proposed treaty of June, 1914, showing that the two Governments were working together hopefully.

There is one other point in the history of the origin of the war that is frequently forgotten by people generally, and that is the nature of the situation in Austria-Hungary. When I visited Buda-Pesth and Vienna, last March, it came to me, almost as a new idea, that, after all, the war started between Austria and Servia. Further, that from the Austro-Hungarian standpoint, the interference of other powers was utterly uncalled for.

During the month of July, and up to the time that England entered the war, Dr. E. J. Dillon was in Vienna. Dr. Dillon is perhaps the best-informed journalist in Europe. If De Blowitz has a successor it is Dillon. I have met him frequently in London, Paris, Petrograd, and elsewhere, and have been familiar with his work for years. His dispatches to the London "Daily Telegraph" from July 11 until August 4, 1914, give a singularly accurate picture of the outlook. His knowledge was so well founded that his dispatches are prophetic.

In a dispatch dated Vienna, July 11 (two weeks before Austria-Hungary sent the note to Servia that caused the war), he says: —

I have received a very remarkable commentary on the feeling called forth in Austria-Hungary against Servia by the Serajevo outrage from one of the highest officials of the State. My informant's statement is as follows: —

"In order to understand the feelings that have been excited in Austria-Hungary by the Serajevo murders, the evils to which this country has already been subjected at the hands of her small neighbors in the southeast must be taken into account. There can be no doubt that Servia's policy for more than ten years past has been directed toward the ultimate end of wresting such regions as are inhabited by Serbs from Austria-Hungary, and that she has perhaps even hoped to gain the entire Southern Slavonic territory now incorporated with the Monarchy."

In my interview with Count Tisza and his associates I went right to the heart of the question: —

"Why did Austria-Hungary send such a peremptory note to Servia with a forty-eight-hour limit?"

"Because," they said, "the intrigues and aims of Servia threatened the existence of the Empire."

"But why the forty-eight-hour limit?"

"Because we knew Servia, knew that nothing but such a demand would bring a reply. Without such a time limit no satisfaction could be secured. Twice before we had to mobilize our armies at an expense of $80,000,000 to $100,000,000 each time, putting a heavy burden on our national budget. The situation had become intolerable and dangerous and finally Servia had plotted to murder our Crown Prince."

"But did you not know," I asked, "that Russia would certainly intervene?"

"It was none of Russia's business. It was a private matter between Servia and us. What would America think if Japan intervened in your Mexican trouble?"

"Yes," I said. "Let us admit that it was none of Russia's business. Still, did you not *know* that Russia would make it her business?"

They said: "We thought the chances of Russia's interfering were about fifty-fifty, but that whatever the consequences we must remove the Servian menace."

I asked if they did not realize that if Russia came in all Europe would be involved. The reply was: "It was none of Europe's business. Europe must interfere at her own risk. Our situation was dangerous and intolerable. Because Servia was a small state we had been very patient, but when our Crown Prince was assassinated we felt we must put an end to the whole Servian danger."

The manner of the Hungarians I saw was even more convincing than their words. Some of the officials gave the impression of men under an obsession. To them the Servian trouble two years ago was the most terrible thing in the world.

Count Berchtold was Foreign Minister when the war broke out, and he wrote all the dispatches of Austria-Hungary, including the note to Servia. The Countess Berchtold is the daughter of a famous Hungarian diplomat. Her father was for many years the Austrian Ambassador to England.

I was fortunate enough to be invited to luncheon by the Count and Countess Berchtold, for I got the most definite information from the Countess Berchtold, who was not only well informed, but expressed herself clearly and objectively.

Into the maze of southeastern European politics I cannot go, so I will give the ideas I got from the Count and Countess in terms understandable to myself and to my readers: —

The southern and eastern boundaries of Austria-Hungary are, so far as race, nationality, and religion are concerned, a sort of twilight zone.

After their success in the two Balkan wars, the Servian

people determined to increase their territory by annexing the provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire inhabited by Slavs.

They believed that our empire would soon fall to pieces, that only the Emperor Francis Joseph held it together. They counted on a revolution in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and on the unreliability of the Slav regiments in the Austrian army.

They not only hated Austria, but regarded her as powerless, as a country ripe for destruction, on the ruins of which they would found the Great Servian Empire. These ideas were set forth, even in their more moderate and serious newspapers. No one could run for office in Servia, unless he were opposed to Austria and backed up the anti-Austrian propaganda.

In the press and on the platform the Servians spoke of the Austro-Hungarian officials and leading men as outlaws, and referred to them as murderers, rogues, cursed Austrians, etc.

We realized that we must once for all clear up this continuing and serious danger.

I also saw Baron Burian, the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary in 1916. He said to me that "Russia was using Servia as a torpedo to wreck our empire."

To summarize: The Austro-Hungarian Empire has about eight Irelands or Mexicos. The worst of these Irelands was Servia. Of course the conditions are not identical, and for the purpose of getting at the real cause of the war it is not necessary to go into the rights and wrongs of the Austro-Servian situation. First let us study the racial situation in Austria-Hungary: —

Austria

	Round figures in tens of thousands
Germans	9,950,000
Czechs	6,440,000
Poles	4,970,000
Ruthenians	3,520,000
Slovenes	1,260,000
Serbo-Croatians	790,000
Italians	770,000
Roumanians	280,000
Total	27,980,000

Hungary

Magyars	10,050,000
Roumanians	2,950,000
Serbo-Croatians	2,940,000
Germans	2,040,000
Slovaks	1,970,000
Ruthenians	480,000
Total	20,430,000

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Serbo-Croatians (orthodox or Moslems of Serbian origin)	2,000,000

For the last thirty years Austro-Hungarian politics have centered entirely about the struggle of the other races (Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Ruthenes, Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Rumanians, and Italians, — nearly 30,000,000 in all) against the German-Magyar ascendancy crystallized in the Dualist Constitution. . . .

The race question, however, is not only an internal problem. Many of the races in the Monarchy have large numbers of their fellows just beyond the boundaries. The bulk of the Poles are in Russian and German Poland; the Ruthenes are but a section of the Little

Russian people occupying the Ukraine — the southwest corner of Russia; three and a half million Rumanians are blood brothers to the inhabitants of Rumania; finally, the Southern Slavs in Servia and Montenegro number 3,500,000 as against 6,500,000 within the Monarchy. The politics of Austria-Hungary are infinitely complicated by nationalist movements among each of these peoples for reunion with their brothers outside.

On the 28th of June, 1914, the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary and his consort were assassinated at Serajevo. This deed inflamed Austria-Hungary, and on July 23 Count Berchtold sent the dispatch that led to the war.

The gist of the Austrian demands, of which there were ten, was as follows: —

1. Servia shall suppress all anti-Austrian publications.
2. Dissolve the Narodna Odbrana and all similar societies, confiscate their funds, and prevent their re-forming.
3. Remove from public education in Servia all teachers and teaching that are anti-Austrian.
4. Remove from military and civil service all officers and officials guilty of anti-Austrian propaganda; Austria will name the persons.
5. Accept collaboration of Austrian representatives in the suppression of anti-Austrian propaganda.
6. Take judicial proceedings against accessories to the plot against the Archduke; Austrian delegates will take part in the investigations.
7. Arrest Major Voija Tankositch and the individual named Milan Ciganovitch.
8. Prevent and punish the illegal traffic in arms and explosives.
9. Send to Austria explanations of all unjustifiable utterances of high Servian officials, at home and abroad.

10. Notify without delay that the above measures are executed. Reply before 6 P.M. on Saturday, July 25.

The answers to the ten points may be summarized thus: —

1. Yes; will suppress all anti-Austrian publications.
2. Yes; will suppress the Narodna Odbrana and similar societies.
3. Yes; will expel all anti-Austrian teachers and teaching as soon as evidence given.
4. Yes; will expel all anti-Austrian officers and officials, if Austria will furnish names and acts of guilty persons.
5. Yes; will accept collaboration of Austrian representatives in these proceedings, as far as consonant with principles of international law and criminal procedure and neighborly relations.
6. Yes; will take the judicial proceedings; will also keep Austria informed; but cannot admit the participation of Austrians in the judicial investigations, as this would be a violation of the Constitution.
7. Yes; have arrested Tankositch; ordered arrest of Ciganovitch.
8. Yes; will suppress and punish traffic in arms and explosives.
9. Yes; will deal with the said high officials, if Austria will supply evidence.
10. Yes; will notify without delay.

If this answer not satisfactory, Servia will abide by decision of the Hague Tribunal.

If all these conditions were not accepted in forty-eight hours, war would immediately be declared. Public opinion in Austria was for war. If Servia accepted, her situation would be almost the same as if she had been reduced to submission by a victorious war. I was constantly told by people, in general, that the note was meant to make war.

In a dispatch on July 24 to the London "Daily Telegraph," from Vienna, Dr. E. J. Dillon said: —

Is it to be war or peace? My personal belief is that war will be avoided. But, having traveled from the extreme south of the Monarchy to Vienna, and conversed with various representatives of the population on the way, I am in a position to affirm that almost everybody hopes fervently that the long-threatening storm will burst, not because the national sentiment is suddenly grown bellicose, but because people are sick to death of the periodic crises which throw public and private life out of gear, paralyze trade and commerce, inflict enormous losses on the wealth-creating classes, and are then settled for a couple of months or years, only to break out anew.

As I have said, Dr. Dillon is one of the very best informed journalists in Europe. I therefore quote fully from him as to the actual belief in Austria, in which he confirms all I learned nearly two years later. He says: —

In a word, the impending break-up of the Habsburg Monarchy is become a recognized political dogma, accepted theoretically by some powers, but firmly held by others and treated by them as the center round which their policy, domestic and foreign, revolves. This is especially true of Servia.

It is no longer mere prestige that is at stake; it is a question of life or death for the Monarchy, and will be dealt with as such. Consequently, adequate provision has been made for whichever alternative Servia may prefer.

That is why only forty-eight hours were allowed for reflection, and why tasks are imposed which will subject the pride of the Servian nation to the most painful ordeal it has ever undergone.

No discussion will be allowed; no extension of time will be granted. Such in outline is the case as stated here.

As to the position of Germany Dr. Dillon is equally accurate. On July 25 he telegraphed: —

> Meanwhile Austria's allies have taken their stand, which is favorable to the action of this Government and to the employment of all the available means to localize the eventual conflict. It is further assumed that Great Britain will, if hostilities should result, hold aloof, and that France will make her influence felt in preventing, rather than waiting to localize, the struggle.
>
> Respecting Russia's attitude in the contingency of war, opinions are openly divided, but no doubt is expressed or felt that if the crisis had not come to a climax until a year or two later, her entire support would be unhesitatingly given to Servia.

The general feeling in Austria-Hungary is expressed by the "Neue Freie Presse," which stated that a peaceful settlement could follow only a "war to the knife against Pan-Slavism."

Sir M. de Bunsen wrote to Sir E. Grey that "the language of the press leaves the impression that the surrender of Servia is neither expected nor really desired."

The Servian Government accepted fully all the demands excepting two. She did not refuse these two demands, but offered to submit them to the Hague Tribunal or to the great powers.

Austria, without a moment's consideration, refused to accept Servia's reply, and declared war immediately.

At this point, in all likelihood, the European war could have been avoided by referring the dispute to The Hague. History will hold Austria-Hungary as having assumed this most terrible responsibility by refusing a course of action which would almost certainly have secured peace.

At the last moment Servia held out another olive branch, as is seen in a dispatch sent from the British Ambassador at Rome on July 28, telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey, as follows: —

At the request of the Minister for Foreign Affairs I submit the following to you: —

In a long conversation this morning Servian Chargé d'Affaires had said he thought that if some explanations were given regarding mode in which Austrian agents would require to intervene under article 5 and article 6, Servia might still accept the whole Austrian Note.

As it was not to be anticipated that Austria would give such explanations to Servia, they might be given to powers engaged in discussions who might then advise Servia to accept without conditions.

The world is entitled to know why Austria-Hungary refused this opportunity to prevent war.

I have taken considerable pains to make clear the *local* situation. Austria-Hungary did not consider sufficiently the *international* situation. Russia was determined to prevent the subjugation of Servia. If neither Russia nor Austria yielded, war between those two powers was inevitable. The moment they went to war Germany must, as a matter of self-preservation, assist Austria. She could not see her ally reduced militarily. For the same reason France could not see the military power of Russia destroyed by the united forces of Germany and Austria, and England could not afford to have France reduced to practical vassalage by Germany.

All these possibilities Sir Edward Grey foresaw at the beginning; too late Germany and Austria-Hungary realized these same possibilities. No combination short of the four powers, England, Germany, France, and

Italy, could have mediated between Austria and Russia, and thus have localized the difficulty. The failure to form such a conference was due to the opposition of Germany, whose policy was to localize the war between Austria and Servia.

War could have been avoided at the start had Austria been willing to go to The Hague, as suggested by Servia, and later by the Czar. Still later, war could have been avoided by a combination of the four powers who could have exercised sufficient restraint on Austria and Russia.

All that I can learn seems to indicate that both Austria and Germany expected the crisis of 1914 to take the same course as the Bosnian crisis of 1908.

Dr. Dillon on Sunday, July 26, telegraphed from Vienna the reasons why Austria expected as free a hand as in 1908: —

> Vigilant attention was paid to the choice of a propitious moment.
>
> It was a moment when the sympathies of Europe were with the Austro-Hungarian people, whose sovereign-designate was cruelly slain by political assassins from Servia at the instigation of men who occupied posts as public servants there.
>
> It was a moment when the French nation, impressed by revelations made in the Senate respecting its inadequate preparedness for war, appeared less than ever minded to take any diplomatic action which might lead to a breach of the peace.
>
> It was a moment when the cares of the British Government were absorbed in forecasting and preparing for the fateful consequences of its internal policy, in regard to Irish Home Rule, which may, it is apprehended, culminate in civil war.
>
> It was a moment when the President and Foreign Secre-

tary of the French Republic were absent in Russia, drinking toasts to the peace of Europe, and celebrating the concord and brotherhood of the French and Russian peoples.

It was a moment when Russia herself was confronted with a problem of revolutionary strikes, which, it is assumed, would set in with oceanic violence if that empire were to embark in war with the Central European powers.

As the week advanced Sir Edward Grey, realizing more and more the seriousness of the situation, finally sent this pregnant message to the British Ambassador in Berlin, dated London, July 31: —

I said to German Ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it His Majesty's Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but, otherwise, I told German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in.

You can add this when sounding Chancellor or Secretary of State as to proposal above.

It is difficult to understand why the German Government failed to avail itself of the opportunity Sir Edward Grey suggested. It would almost seem as if the Chancellor had been overruled.

It will be remembered that while the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 was threatening between France and Germany, on account of France's opposition to the candidacy of the Prince of Hohenzollern to the throne of Spain, suddenly the threat of war was averted by the withdrawal of the candidacy of the Prince.

The King of Prussia did not want war. Bismarck himself tells us fully how he was able to make war against the opposition of the King.

Here is Prince Bismarck's own account of his act which led France to declare war on Germany: —

The Ems Telegram[1]

On July 12, 1870, I decided to hurry off from Varzin to Ems to discuss with His Majesty about summoning the Reichstag for the purpose of the mobilization. As I passed through Wussow my friend Mulert, the old clergyman, stood before the parsonage door and warmly greeted me; my answer from the open carriage was a thrust in *quarte* and *tierce* in the air, and he clearly understood that I believed I was going to war. As I entered the courtyard of my house at Berlin, and before leaving the carriage, I received telegrams from which it appeared that the King was continuing to treat with Benedetti, even after the French threats and outrages in parliament and in the press, and not referring him with calm reserve to his ministers. During the meal, at which Moltke and Roon were present, the announcement arrived from the embassy in Paris that the Prince of Hohenzollern had renounced his candidature in order to prevent the war with which France threatened us. My first idea was to retire from the service, because, after all the insolent challenges which had gone before, I perceived in this extorted submission a humiliation of Germany for which I did not desire to be responsible. This impression of a wound to our sense of national honor by the compulsory withdrawal so dominated me that I had already decided to announce my retirement at Ems.

I was very much depressed, for I saw no means of repairing the corroding injury I dreaded to our national position from a timorous policy, unless by picking quarrels clumsily and seeking them artificially. I already regarded war at

[1] From *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman.* By Himself. Harper & Bros., publishers.

that time as a necessity, which we could no longer avoid with honor. I telegraphed to my people at Varzin not to pack up or start, for I should be back again in a few days. I now believed in peace; but as I would not represent the attitude by which this peace had been purchased, I gave up the journey to Ems and asked Count Eulenburg to go thither and represent my opinion to His Majesty. In the same sense I conversed with the Minister of War, Von Roon: we had got the slap in the face from France, and had been reduced, by our complaisance, to look like seekers of a quarrel if we entered upon war, the only way in which we could wipe away the stain. My position was now untenable, solely because, during his course at the baths, the King, under pressure of threats, had given audience to the French Ambassador for four consecutive days, and had exposed his royal person to insolent treatment from this foreign agent without ministerial assistance. Through this inclination to take state business upon himself in person and alone, the King had been forced into a position which I could not defend; in my judgment His Majesty while at Ems ought to have refused every business communication from the French negotiator, who was not on the same footing with him, and to have referred him to the department in Berlin. The department would then have had to obtain His Majesty's decision by a representation at Ems, or, if dilatory treatment were considered useful, by a report in writing. But His Majesty, however careful in his usual respect for departmental relations, was too fond, not indeed of deciding important questions personally, but, at all events, of discussing them, to make a proper use of the shelter with which the Sovereign is purposely surrounded against importunities and inconvenient questionings and demands. That the King, considering the consciousness of his supreme dignity which he possessed in so high a degree, did not withdraw at the very beginning from Benedetti's importunity was to be attributed for the most part to the influence exercised upon him by the Queen, who was at Coblenz close by. He was seventy-three years old, a lover of peace, and disinclined to risk the laurels of 1866 in a fresh struggle; but when he was

free from the feminine influence, the sense of honor of the heir of Frederick the Great and of a Prussian officer always remained paramount. Against the opposition of his consort, due to her natural feminine timidity and lack of national feeling, the King's power of resistance was weakened by his knightly regard for the lady and his kingly consideration for a Queen, and especially for his own Queen. I have been told that Queen Augusta implored her husband with tears, before his departure from Ems to Berlin, to bear in mind Jena and Tilsit and avert war. I consider the statement authentic, even to the tears.

Having decided to resign, in spite of the remonstrances which Roon made against it, I invited him and Moltke to dine with me alone on the 13th, and communicated to them at table my views and projects for doing so. Both were greatly depressed, and reproached me indirectly with selfishly availing myself of my greater facility for withdrawing from service. I maintained the position that I could not offer up my sense of honor to politics, that both of them, being professional soldiers and consequently without freedom of choice, need not take the same point of view as a responsible Foreign Minister. During the conversation I was informed that a telegram from Ems, in cipher, if I recollect rightly, of about 200 "groups," was being deciphered. When the copy was handed to me it showed that Abeken had drawn up and signed the telegram at His Majesty's command, and I read it out to my guests, whose dejection was so great that they turned away from food and drink. On a repeated examination of the document I lingered upon the authorization of His Majesty, which included a command, immediately to communicate Benedetti's fresh demand and its rejection both to our ambassadors and to the press. I put a few questions to Moltke as to the extent of his confidence in the state of our preparations, especially as to the time they would still require in order to meet this sudden risk of war. He answered that if there was to be war he expected no advantage to us by deferring its outbreak; and even if we should not be strong enough at first to protect all the territories on the left bank of the Rhine against French

invasion, our preparations would nevertheless soon overtake those of the French, while at a later period this advantage would be diminished; he regarded a rapid outbreak as, on the whole, more favorable to us than delay.

I made use of the royal authorization, communicated to me through Abeken, to publish the contents of the telegram; and in the presence of my two guests I reduced the telegram, by striking out words, but without adding or altering, to the following form: "After the news of the renunciation of the hereditary Prince of Hohenzollern had been officially communicated to the Imperial Government of France by the Royal Government of Spain, the French Ambassador at Ems made the further demand to His Majesty the King that he would authorize him to telegraph to Paris that His Majesty the King bound himself for all future time never again to give his consent if the Hohenzollerns should renew their candidature. His Majesty the King thereupon decided not to receive the French Ambassador again, and sent to tell him through the aide-de-camp on duty that His Majesty had nothing further to communicate to the ambassador." The difference in the effect of the abbreviated text of the Ems telegram as compared with that produced by the original was not the result of stronger words, but of the form, which made this announcement appear decisive, while Abeken's version would only have been regarded as a fragment of a negotiation still pending, and to be continued at Berlin.

After I had read out the concentrated edition to my two guests, Moltke remarked: "Now it has a different ring; it sounded before like a parley; now it is like a flourish in answer to a challenge." I went on to explain: "If in execution of His Majesty's order I at once communicate this text, which contains no alteration in or addition to the telegram, not only to the newspapers, but also by telegraph to all our embassies, it will be known in Paris before midnight, and not only on account of its contents, but also on account of the manner of its distribution, will have the effect of a red rag upon the Gallic bull. Fight we must if we do not want to act the part of the vanquished without a battle. Success,

however, essentially depends upon the impression which the origination of the war makes upon us and others; it is important that we should be the ones attacked, and this the Gallic overweening and touchiness will do for us, if we announce in the face of Europe, so far as we can without the speaking-tube of the Reichstag, that we fearlessly meet the public threats of France."

This explanation brought about in the two generals a revulsion to a more joyous mood, the liveliness of which surprised me. They had suddenly recovered their pleasure in eating and drinking and spoke in a more cheerful vein. Roon said: "Our God of old lives still and will not let us perish in disgrace." Moltke so far relinquished his passive equanimity that, glancing up joyously toward the ceiling and abandoning his usual punctiliousness of speech, he smote his hand upon his breast and said: "If I may but live to lead our armies in such a war, then the devil may come directly afterwards and fetch away the 'old carcass.'" He was less robust at that time than afterwards, and doubted whether he would survive the hardships of the campaign.

How keenly he wanted to put in practice his military and strategic tastes and ability I observed not only on this occasion, but also in the days before the outbreak of the Bohemian War. In both cases I found my military colleague in the King's service changed from his usual dry and silent habit, cheerful, lively, I might even say merry.

The following dispatch of Baron Beyens, dated July 26, 1914, gives what is probably a fairly accurate view of the military opinion in Germany: —

To justify these conclusions I must remind you of the opinion which prevails in the German General Staff, that war with France and Russia is unavoidable and near, an opinion which the Emperor has been induced to share. Such a war, ardently desired by the military and Pan-German party, might be underaken to-day, as this party think, in circumstances which are extremely favorable to Germany, and which probably will not again present themselves for

some time. Germany has finished the strengthening of her army which was decreed by the law of 1912, and, on the other hand, she feels that she cannot carry on indefinitely a race in armaments with Russia and France which would end in her ruin. The Wehrbeitrag has been a disappointment for the Imperial Government, to whom it has demonstrated the limits of the national wealth. Russia has made the mistake of making a display of her strength before having finished her military reorganization. That strength will not be formidable for several years: at the present moment it lacks the railway lines necessary for its deployment. As to France, M. Charles Humbert has revealed her deficiency in guns of large caliber, but apparently it is this arm that will decide the fate of battles. For the rest, England, which during the last two years Germany has been trying, not without some success, to detach from France and Russia, is paralyzed by internal dissensions and her Irish quarrels.

An extremely judicial analysis is made by M. P. Price in his book, "The Diplomatic History of the War" (Scribner's, 1915), as follows: —

On the other hand, there is evidence to the effect that during the negotiations after the Austrian note to Servia, Germany, however stupidly and supinely she handled the Austro-Servian dispute, was fully alive to the danger to Europe of a Russo-Austrian conflict. Thus the telegrams passing between the London, Berlin, St. Petersburg, and Paris Foreign Offices show that although Germany refused Sir Edward Grey's suggestion of a four power ambassadorial conference in London, nevertheless she supported the mediation of four powers not immediately concerned at Vienna and St. Petersburg, with a view to inducing Austria and Russia to come to terms with each other. Indeed, Germany was on more than one occasion the means of conveying to Austria proposals concerning the need of moderation in Vienna and about the guarantees which Servia could reasonably be expected to give. (British White Book, Nos. 18, 95, 98.) The pressure brought to bear on Austria by Germany

during the last few days of negotiations is also seen in the German "Denkschrift." In addition to these, numerous British press correspondents in Berlin and St. Petersburg, between July 25 and 30, show that Germany, so far from being an instigator, was doing all she could, having regard to the difficult position in which she was placed, to make her ally come to terms with Russia.

Germany's great initial blunder was that she refused to regard the Austro-Servian dispute as one that concerned any other but those two countries, and would not recognize the claim of Russia to be consulted about the fate of Servia. Hence her interpretation of four power mediation was not the same as Russia's. She wanted mediation to aim at securing for Austria a "free hand." Russia wanted mediation which would give her a chance of settling the Servian question according to her ideas.

I had a talk with Mr. A. G. Gardiner, editor of the London "Daily News," as to some statements he made about Von Bethmann-Hollweg and Sir Edward Grey. He assured me that he had sure sources of information, as to which he said (I quote Mr. Gardiner's exact words): —

It is said, on such high authority that the statement is entitled to respect, that on the fatal Saturday when he signed the declaration of war against Russia the Kaiser, having written his signature, threw the pen across the table and said, to the triumphant soldiers around him, "Gentlemen, you will live to regret this."

It is the opinion of those in this country most intimate with the inner history of the diplomatic struggle that culminated in the war that both the Kaiser and his Chancellor wanted peace.

"Let us be just to Bethmann-Hollweg," said a distinguished Foreign Office representative when the conduct of the Chancellor was being criticized. "You see only his failure. We have seen when he has not failed — when he has

fought for peace and won. He fought for peace this time but lost."

A change came when Baron Marschall von Bieberstein superseded Metternich, and when a little later (on the Baron's death) Prince Lichnowsky came, with his gentle manner and obvious frankness of purpose. It seemed then, especially with the successful coöperation of England and Germany during the Balkan wars, that the danger-point in the relations of the two peoples was passed, and Sir Edward Grey was clearly moving with strong hope toward an understanding with Germany.

Sir Edward Grey's efforts for peace during the last fatal week of July are on record, and no one who saw him in the House during those thrilling days can doubt either his surprise at the sudden blow or his passionate desire to save Europe from the coming disaster. When some one met him after his speech of August 3, and rather ineptly offered his congratulations, he turned away with the remark, "This is the saddest day of my life." I am told at the Cabinet council next morning more than one minister broke down under the dreadful strain, and that Sir Edward Grey was among them. But, indeed, there were more tears shed in England in those tragic days than ever before. And they were not tears of weakness but of unspeakable grief.

Lord Haldane told me that for the first two months of the war he saw Sir Edward Grey almost daily. Sir Edward Grey made his home at Lord Haldane's house. Lord Haldane told me that during those months Sir Edward Grey lived in Gethsemane.

Von Bethmann-Hollweg has been continually attacked in Germany for his pre-war pacific policy. An anonymous pamphleteer made these charges which were finally taken up in the Reichstag: —

Concerning the activities of the Chancellor immediately before the war, known to us from published dispatches and notes, it is unnecessary to speak in detail. It is plain that,

taken as a whole, his untiring efforts up to the very last hour, regardless of military happenings, were directed to prevent at any price the long unavoidable war. In vain were the warnings of the General Staff, the Minister of War, and men of authority in the naval department pointed to the necessity of mobilization. They succeeded in half convincing the Emperor of its absolute necessity. On Thursday, July 30, the afternoon police papers and the Berlin "Lokal Anzeiger" published the fact of the mobilization, but the interference of Von Bethmann-Hollweg served to nullify this decisive action.

If ever there was a time in a decisive hour when the task of responsible military leaders has been rendered nearly impossible, it was before the outbreak of this war, when Germany faced a fight for her very existence, and that is the fault of her leading statesman. No condemnation can be severe enough for much unnecessary blood that has been shed due to the policy of this political sleepwalker.

Von Bethmann-Hollweg replied to this attack by a speech in the Reichstag which is reported in a Berlin dispatch by the Associated Press: —

Berlin, June 5, 1916. — One of the most stirring passages of the speech came when the Chancellor replied to a pamphleteer's charge that in the opening days of the war he had believed England would have remained Germany's friend, or at least neutral, and that he had wasted three days parleying with England, three days which meant an enormous prolongation of the war because the first blow was not struck promptly enough.

> I know that my attempts at an understanding with England [said the Chancellor] are my capital offense, but what was Germany's position prior to the war? France and Russia were united in an indissoluble alliance. There was a strong anti-German party in Russia and an influential and growing section in France which was urging revenge and war. Russia could be held in check only if the hope of English aid was successfully

taken from them. They would then have never ventured on war. If I wished to work against war I had to attempt to enter into relationships with England.

I am not ashamed of my conduct, even though it proved abortive. He who on that account charges me with being the cause of the world-catastrophe, with its hecatombs of human sacrifices, may make his accusation before God. I shall await God's judgment calmly. [Extract.]

There is no doubt that Von Bethmann-Hollwog, Herr Zimmermann, and the Kaiser were opposed to war. The military chiefs based their decision on the dangers arising from Russia's mobilization.

On the other hand [writes G. Lowes Dickinson, referring to Russia's mobilization], it must be remembered that in 1909 Austria had mobilized against Servia and Montenegro, and in 1912–13 Russia and Austria had mobilized against each other without war ensuing in either case. Moreover, in view of the slowness of Russian mobilization, it is difficult to believe that a day or two would make the difference between security and ruin to Germany. However, it is possible that the Kaiser was so advised by his soldiers, and genuinely believed the country to be in danger. We do not definitely know. What we do know is, that it was the German ultimatum that precipitated the war.

We are informed, however, by Baron Beyens that even at the last moment the German Foreign Office made one more effort for peace. Baron Beyens says:—

As no reply had been received from St. Petersburg by noon the next day (after the dispatch of the German ultimatum), MM. de Jagow and Zimmermann (I have it from the latter) hurried to the Chancellor and the Kaiser to prevent the issue of the order for general mobilization, and to persuade His Majesty to wait till the following day. It was the last effort of their dying pacifism, or the last awak-

ening of their conscience. Their efforts were broken against the irreducible obstinacy of the Minister of War and the army chiefs, who represented to the Kaiser the disastrous consequences of a delay of twenty-four hours.

CHAPTER V

WHY DID ENGLAND ENTER THE WAR?

THERE is such a strong impression that this war is at bottom a war between England and Germany that one forgets that the cause of the war was very remote from England.

Sir Edward Grey, in a dispatch, July 24, to the British Ambassador at Vienna, said: —

> The merits of the dispute between Austria and Servia were not the concern of His Majesty's Government.

And in a dispatch, July 27, to the British Ambassador at Vienna, Sir Edward Grey reports a conversation with Count Mensdorff, in which he said:—

> If they could make war on Servia and at the same time satisfy Russia, well and good; but, if not, the consequences would be incalculable.

England's interest in the Servian question was wholly as it might affect the peace of Europe.

At the outbreak of the war England was allied with Japan and Portugal. She had a naval agreement with France. Inasmuch as France had massed her navy in the Mediterranean so that England might concentrate her fleet in the North Sea, England had agreed, in case France became involved in war, to protect her northern coasts. The actual relation of England to Russia and France is clearly stated by Prince von Bülow in the new edition of his book, "Imperial Germany." In his earlier edition he said: —

Owing to her alliance with France, and the complications in the East, Russia has often supported the Anglo-French Entente, so that we are justified in speaking of a Triple Entente as a counterpart to the Triple Alliance.

In his new edition, published since the beginning of the war, he adds: —

However, it was not till the outbreak of war that the Triple Entente became a solid coalition. As late as April 24, 1914, Baron Beyens, the Belgian Minister in Berlin, stated in connection with the rumor that the Russian Ambassador in Paris, M. Iswolski, was to be transferred to London, that M. Iswolski would be able to convince himself there that public opinion in England had not the slightest desire to see England lose her freedom of action by a formal treaty which would bind her fate to that of Russia and France. It was the London Protocol of September 5, 1914, that changed the hitherto more or less loose connection between the three powers into a close alliance.

When the war broke out, it was an anxious and terrible question in France as to what England would do. And as the days passed and France faced her critical hour, the uncertainty as to England became agonizing.

The general feeling the world over of those who favored France and were friendly to Great Britain was expressed by Admiral Mahan during the days after war was declared, and while England still remained out. I quote from a dispatch to the London "Times," dated New York, August 3, 1914: —

In a highly important interview to-night, Rear-Admiral Mahan declared that England must at once throw her preponderating fleet against Germany for the chief purpose of maintaining her own position as a world-power. For England, Admiral Mahan said, it was a question, if she remained

out of the war, of sacrificing her empire in the next generation to the interest of this generation.

Knowing from past experience how the matter must be viewed by Russia, it is incredible that Austria would have ventured on the ultimatum unless she was assured beforehand of the consent of Germany to it. The moment was auspicious for striking down France and Russia before they regained their full strength.

Great Britain, as the third member of the Entente, finds herself in the position of Prussia in 1805, when she permitted Napoleon to strike down Austria unaided and was herself struck down the following year at Jena, or in that of France in 1866, when she stood by while Prussia crushed Austria and was herself overwhelmed in 1870. Germany's procedure is to overwhelm at once by concentrated preparation and impetuous momentum.

In my judgment a right appreciation of the situation should determine Great Britain to declare war at once, otherwise her Entente engagements, whatever the letter, will be in spirit violated, and she will earn the entire distrust of all probable future allies.

It will be remembered that the Haldane mission of 1912 failed because the German Government wanted a treaty, by which the British Government believed that "while Germany in case of a European conflict would have remained free to support her friends, England would have been forbidden to raise a finger in defense of hers."

On Saturday the 25th of July, 1914, the Austrian note to Servia was known in the chancelleries of Europe. On the following Wednesday, July 29, we have from Sir Edward Grey the first intimation as to the possibility of England's participation in the war.

To M. Cambon, the French Ambassador in London, he said: —

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie, British Ambassador at Paris

Foreign Office, July 29, 1914.

Sir:

After telling M. Cambon to-day how grave the situation seemed to be, I told him that I meant to tell the German Ambassador to-day that he must not be misled by the friendly tone of our conversations into any sense of false security that we should stand aside if all the efforts to preserve the peace, which we were now making in common with Germany, failed. But I went on to say to M. Cambon that I thought it necessary to tell him also that public opinion here approached the present difficulty from a quite different point of view from that taken during the difficulty as to Morocco a few years ago. . . . In the present case the dispute between Austria and Servia was not one in which we felt called to take a hand. Even if the question became one between Austria and Russia we should not feel called upon to take a hand in it. . . . If Germany became involved and France became involved, we had not made up our minds what we should do; it was a case that we should have to consider. France would then have been drawn into a quarrel which was not hers, but in which, owing to her alliance, her honor and interest obliged her to engage. We were free from engagements, and we should have to decide what British interests required us to do. I thought it necessary to say that, because, as he knew, we were taking all precautions with regard to our fleet, and I was about to warn Prince Lichnowsky not to count on our standing aside, but it would not be fair that I should let M. Cambon be misled into supposing that this meant that we had decided what to do in a contingency that I still hoped might not arise.

M. Cambon said that I had explained the situation very clearly. He understood it to be that in a Balkan quarrel, and in a struggle for supremacy between Teuton and Slav, we should not feel called to intervene; should other issues be raised, and Germany and France become involved, so that the question became one of the hegemony of Europe, we should then decide what it was necessary for us to do. He

seemed quite prepared for this announcement, and made no criticism upon it.

I quote so fully because it is such a clear exposition of England's attitude toward French interests. On the same day Sir Edward Grey made a statement on similar lines to the German Ambassador in London, discussing the European situation with reference to England's position.[1]

I give the complete dispatch, No. 89: —

Sir E. Grey to Sir E. Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin

Foreign Office, July 29, 1914.

Sir:

After speaking to the German Ambassador this afternoon about the European situation, I said that I wished to say to him, in a quite private and friendly way, something that was on my mind. The situation was very grave. While it was restricted to the issues at present actually involved we had no thought of interfering in it. But if Germany became involved in it, and then France, the issue might be so great that it would involve all European interests; and I did not wish him to be misled by the friendly tone of our conversation — which I hoped would continue — into thinking that we should stand aside.

He said that he quite understood this, but he asked whether I meant that we should, under certain circumstances, intervene?

I replied that I did not wish to say that, or to use anything that was like a threat or an attempt to apply pressure by saying that, if things became worse, we should intervene. There would be no question of our intervening if Germany was not involved, or even if France was not involved. But we knew very well, that if the issue did become such that we thought British interests required us to intervene, we must intervene at once, and the decision would have to be very

[1] British White Book, No. 88.

rapid, just as the decisions of other powers had to be. I hoped that the friendly tone of our conversations would continue as at present, and that I should be able to keep as closely in touch with the German Government in working for peace. But if we failed in our efforts to keep the peace, and if the issue spread so that it involved practically every European interest, I did not wish to be open to any reproach from him that the friendly tone of all our conversations had misled him or his Government into supposing that we should not take action, and to the reproach that, if they had not been so misled, the course of things might have been different.

The German Ambassador took no exception to what I had said; indeed, he told me that it accorded with what he had already given in Berlin as his view of the situation.

I am, &c.

E. Grey.

The most ominous dispatch up to this time is one dated, the same day, Berlin, July 29, from the British Ambassador in Berlin to Sir Edward Grey. It reports the interview with Von Bethmann-Hollweg after the fateful meeting at Potsdam: —

Sir E. Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin, to Sir E. Grey
(Received July 29)

(Telegraphic.) *Berlin, July 29, 1914.*

I was asked to call upon the Chancellor to-night. His Excellency had just returned from Potsdam.

He said that should Austria be attacked by Russia a European conflagration might, he feared, become inevitable, owing to Germany's obligations as Austria's ally, in spite of his continued efforts to maintain peace. He then proceeded to make the following strong bid for British neutrality. He said that it was clear, so far as he was able to judge the main principle which governed British policy, that Great Britain would never stand by and allow France to be crushed in any

conflict there might be. That, however, was not the object at which Germany aimed. Provided that neutrality of Great Britain were certain, every assurance would be given to the British Government that the Imperial Government aimed at no territorial acquisitions at the expense of France should they prove victorious in any war that might ensue.

I questioned His Excellency about the French colonies, and he said that he was unable to give a similar undertaking in that respect. As regards Holland, however, His Excellency said that, so long as Germany's adversaries respected the integrity and neutrality of the Netherlands, Germany was ready to give His Majesty's Government an assurance that she would do likewise. It depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany.

His Excellency ended by saying that ever since he had been Chancellor the object of his policy had been, as you were aware, to bring about an understanding with England; he trusted that these assurances might form the basis of that understanding which he so much desired. He had in mind a general neutrality agreement between England and Germany, though it was of course at the present moment too early to discuss details, and an assurance of British neutrality in the conflict which present crisis might possibly produce, would enable him to look forward to realization of his desire.

To this telegram Sir Edward Grey replied on Thursday, July 30, 1914: —

Sir E. Grey to Sir E. Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin

(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, July 30, 1914.*

Your telegram of 29th July.

His Majesty's Government cannot for a moment entertain the Chancellor's proposal that they should bind themselves to neutrality on such terms.

What he asks us in effect is to engage to stand by while

French colonies are taken and France is beaten so long as Germany does not take French territory as distinct from the colonies.

From the material point of view such a proposal is unacceptable, for France, without further territory in Europe being taken from her, could be so crushed as to lose her position as a great power, and become subordinate to German policy.

Altogether apart from that, it would be a disgrace for us to make this bargain with Germany at the expense of France, a disgrace from which the good name of this country would never recover.

The Chancellor also in effect asks us to bargain away whatever obligation or interest we have as regards the neutrality of Belgium. We could not entertain that bargain either.

It is difficult to see how the British Government could have taken a different stand on this point.

In the same dispatch Sir Edward Grey makes a very strong bid for peace in these words: —

And I will say this: If the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately. I have desired this and worked for it, as far as I could, through the last Balkan crisis, and, Germany having a corresponding object, our relations sensibly improved. The idea has hitherto been too Utopian to form the subject of definite proposals, but if this present crisis, so much more acute than any that Europe has gone through for generations, be safely passed, I am hopeful that the relief and reaction which will follow may make possible some more definite *rapprochement* between the powers than has been possible hitherto.

On the same day, July 30, Sir Edward Grey telegraphs to the British Ambassador in Berlin, this warning to Germany: —

I have warned Prince Lichnowsky that Germany must not count upon our standing aside in all circumstances.

Again, on the same day, July 30, Sir Edward Grey makes reference to a letter he had written two years ago to the French Ambassador in London, M. Cambon, "in which we agreed that if the peace of Europe was seriously threatened, we would discuss what we were prepared to do."

Still Sir Edward Grey persisted in his efforts for peace, and on Friday, July 31, he telegraphed to the British Ambassador in Berlin a dispatch in which he used these words: —

I said to German Ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward, which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it His Majesty's Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but, otherwise, I told German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in. [Extract.]

This was the nearest approach to a threat that Sir Edward Grey used. He refused to encourage Russia and France. He worked solely for peace.

Germany and Austria failed to understand Russia.

In a dispatch, July 26, 1914, from the British Ambassador at Vienna to Sir Edward Grey, reporting a conversation with the German Ambassador at Vienna, he says: —

According to confident belief of German Ambassador, Russia will keep quiet during chastisement of Servia, which Austria-Hungary is resolved to inflict, having received assurances that no Servian territory will be annexed by Austria-Hungary. . . . The Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs would not, His Excellency thought, be so imprudent as to take a step which would probably result in many frontier questions in which Russia is interested, such as Swedish, Polish, Ruthene, Rumanian, and Persian questions, being brought into the melting-pot. France, too, was not at all in a condition for facing a war.

And on July 28 the Austrian Ambassador in Berlin informed Sir Edward Goschen "that a general war was most unlikely, as Russia neither wanted nor was in a position to make war." The British Ambassador believed that the same opinion was shared by many people in Berlin.

Sir R. Rodd, British Ambassador in Rome, in a dispatch, July 29, said that the Italian Foreign Minister stated "that there seemed to be a difficulty in making Germany believe that Russia was in earnest."

Baron Beyens records a conversation with his colleague, M. Bollati, the Italian Ambassador at Berlin in which the latter took the view that

At Vienna as at Berlin they were persuaded that Russia, in spite of the official assurances exchanged quite recently between the Tsar and M. Poincaré, as to the complete preparations of the armies of the two allies, was not in a position to sustain a European war and would not dare to plunge into so perilous an adventure.

Baron Beyens continues: —

At Berlin the opinion that Russia was unable to face a European war prevailed not only in the official world and in society, but among all the manufacturers who specialized

in the construction of armaments. M. Krupp, the best qualified among them to express an opinion, announced on the 28th July, at a table next mine at the Hotel Bristol, that the Russian artillery was neither good nor complete, while that of the German army had never been of such superior quality. It would be folly on the part of Russia, the great maker of guns concluded, to dare to make war on Germany and Austria under these conditions.

Austria-Hungary, backed by Germany, evidently felt that the chances for war with Russia were slight.

The extremely well-informed journalist, Dr. E. J. Dillon, telegraphed on August 4 to the London "Daily Telegraph" the beliefs in Vienna in these words: —

Even the Government here did not expect that events would take the course which all Europe is now deploring. They certainly recognized it as a contingency to be reckoned with, and they accordingly prepared for it. But they entertained hopes that a conflict would be restricted to the Balkan Peninsula.

In his speech before the Reichstag on December 2, 1914, Von Bethmann-Hollweg makes this statement: —

In spite of all protestations of peace London gave it to be understood in Petrograd that she was taking her stand on the side of France and Russia. This is proved clearly and incontestably by the publications of the various Cabinets, and especially by that of the English Blue Book itself. Then, indeed, it was impossible to hold things back in Petrograd.

On this question we possess a witness who is entirely above suspicion, the report of the Belgian Chargé d'Affaires in Petrograd, written on July 30. He reports: "To-day in Petrograd the people are firmly convinced, indeed they have assurances, that England will stand by France. This support has an extraordinary influence, and has done not a little to gain the upper hand for the war party."

If the statement of July 30, of the Belgian Chargé d'Affaires is correct, how can we account for this letter from the President of the French Republic to King George?

Letter from the French President to King George

Paris, July 31, 1914

From all the information which reaches us, it would seem that war would be inevitable if Germany were convinced that the British Government would not intervene in a conflict in which France might be engaged; if, on the other hand, Germany were convinced that the *entente cordiale* would be affirmed, in case of need, even to the extent of taking the field side by side, there would be the greatest chance that peace would remain unbroken. [Extract.]

Or how can we account for the reply from King George to the French President?

Letter from King George to the French President

Buckingham Palace, August 1, 1914.

It would be a source of real satisfaction to me if our united efforts were to meet with success, and I am still not without hope that the terrible events which seem so near may be averted.

I am personally using my best endeavors with the Emperors of Russia and Germany towards finding some solution by which actual military operations may at any rate be postponed, and time be thus given for calm discussion between the powers. I intend to prosecute these efforts without intermission so long as any hope remains of an amicable settlement.

As to the attitude of my country, events are changing so rapidly that it is difficult to forecast future developments; but you may be assured that my Government will continue

to discuss freely and frankly any point which might arise of interest to our two nations with M. Cambon.

Believe me,
M. le Président,
(Signed) GEORGE R.I.

The actual situation is given in the following:—

Sir Edward Grey to Sir F. Bertie, British Ambassador at Paris

Foreign Office, July 31, 1914.

Sir:

M. Cambon referred to-day to a telegram that had been shown to Sir Arthur Nicolson [British Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs] this morning from the French Ambassador in Berlin, saying that it was the uncertainty with regard to whether we would intervene which was the encouraging element in Berlin, and that, if we would only declare definitely on the side of Russia and France, it would decide the German attitude in favor of peace.

M. Cambon then asked me for my reply to what he had said yesterday.

I said that we had come to the conclusion, in the Cabinet to-day, that we could not give any pledge at the present time. Though we should have to put our policy before Parliament, we could not pledge Parliament in advance. Up to the present moment, we did not feel, and public opinion did not feel, that any treaties or obligations of this country were involved. Further developments might alter this situation and cause the Government and Parliament to take the view that intervention was justified. The preservation of the neutrality of Belgium might be, I would not say a decisive, but an important factor, in determining our attitude. Whether we proposed to Parliament to intervene or not to intervene in a war, Parliament would wish to know how we stood with regard to the neutrality of Belgium, and it might be that I should ask both France and Germany whether each was prepared to undertake an engagement that she would not be the first to violate the neutrality of Belgium.

M. Cambon repeated his question whether we would help France if Germany made an attack on her.

I said that I could only adhere to the answer that, as far as things had gone at present, we could not take any engagement. [Extract.]

On the 29th of July, Sir Edward Grey had informed the German Ambassador in London that there would be no question of England intervening if France was not involved. But that if they thought British interests were involved, England must intervene at once. And in a statement in the House of Commons, August 27, 1914, Sir Edward Grey said: —

The Cabinet did, however, consider most carefully the next morning — that is, Sunday, August 2 — the conditions on which we could remain neutral, and came to the conclusion that respect for the neutrality of Belgium must be one of these conditions. The German Chancellor had already been told on July 30th that we could not bargain that way. [Extract.]

To get England's point of view, one must read the dispatch Sir Edward Grey sent to the British Ambassador at Berlin on July 30, 1914, printed in this chapter. And also the dispatch sent by Von Bethmann-Hollweg on July 30 to the Austrian Government, and first made public in the Reichstag November 9, 1916, printed in the chapter entitled "The Thirteen Days."

In his communications to France and Russia, Sir Edward Grey said in substance: "If there is war, we cannot promise to help you," and to Germany and Austria, "If there is war, we cannot promise to stand aside."

Germany always insisted that Austria-Hungary must have a free hand to war on Servia, and that

England must restrain Russia. At no point did Germany or Austria-Hungary admit the essentially European nature of the conflict.

The following dispatch reveals another lost opportunity for peace on common-sense conditions: —

Russian Chargé d'Affaires at Berlin to Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs

(Telegram.) *Berlin, July 14 (27), 1914.*

Before my visit to the Minister for Foreign Affairs to-day His Excellency had received the French Ambassador, who endeavored to induce him to accept the British proposal for action in favor of peace, such action to be taken simultaneously at St. Petersburg and at Vienna by Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and France. Cambon suggested that these powers should give their advice to Vienna in the following terms: "To abstain from all action which might aggravate the existing situation." (S'abstenir de tout acte qui pourrait aggraver la situation de l'heure actuelle.) By adopting this vague formula, all mention of the necessity of refraining from invading Servia might be avoided. Jagow refused point-blank to accept this suggestion in spite of the entreaties of the Ambassador, who emphasized, as a good feature of the suggestion, the mixed grouping of the powers, thanks to which the opposition between the Alliance and the Entente — a matter of which Jagow himself had often complained — was avoided.

Again Russia as late as July 31 gives another chance for peace: —

Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs to Russian Ambassadors at Berlin, Vienna, Paris, London, and Rome

(Telegram.) *St. Petersburg, July 18 (31), 1914.*

Please refer to my telegram of 17 (30) July. The British Ambassador, on the instructions of his Government, has informed me of the wish of the London Cabinet to make

certain modifications in the formula which I suggested yesterday to the German Ambassador. I replied that I accepted the British suggestion. I accordingly send you the text of the modified formula which is as follows: —

"If Austria consents to stay the march of her troops on Servian territory; and if, recognizing that the Austro-Servian conflict has assumed the character of a question of European interest, she admits that the great powers may examine the satisfaction which Servia can accord to the Austro-Hungarian Government without injury to her rights as a sovereign State or her independence, Russia undertakes to maintain her waiting attitude."

Can any one say, after reading this dispatch, that Sir Edward Grey did not use his influence on Russia wisely?

But at no time would Austria-Hungary or Germany agree to the suspension of hostilities against Servia.

On July 29 the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs asked the German Government to take a threatening attitude toward Russia for the latter's partial mobilization, as is seen from the following dispatch: —

Count Berchtold to Count Szogyeny at Berlin

(Telegraphic.) *Vienna, July 29, 1914.*

As a last effort to maintain the peace of Europe, I consider it desirable that our representative and the representative of Germany at St. Petersburg, and, if necessary, at Paris, should at once be instructed to declare to the Governments to whom they are accredited, in a friendly manner, that the continuance of the Russian mobilization would have as a result counter-measures in Germany and Austria-Hungary, which must lead to serious consequences.

Your Excellency will add that, as can be understood, in our military operations against Servia we will not allow ourselves to be diverted from our path.

The Imperial and Royal Ambassadors at St. Petersburg

and Paris are receiving identical instructions to make the above declaration as soon as their German colleague receives similar instructions.

It will be seen that this "last effort" to maintain peace insisted that Austria must continue her operations against Servia. This was the immovable determination from the first.

The German White Book contains a statement issued by the German Foreign Office, dated Berlin, August, 1914, from which I make the following extract, which again explains the fundamental difficulty in preventing war: —

Foreign Office, Berlin, August, 1914.

Under these circumstances it was clear to Austria that it was not compatible with the dignity and the spirit of self-preservation of the Monarchy to view idly any longer this agitation across the border. The Imperial and Royal Government apprised Germany of this conception and asked for our opinion. With all our heart we were able to agree with our ally's estimate of the situation and assure him that any action considered necessary to end the movement in Servia directed against the conservation of the Monarchy would meet with our approval.

We were perfectly aware that a possible warlike attitude of Austria-Hungary against Servia might bring Russia upon the field, and that it might therefore involve us in a war, in accordance with our duty as allies.

How Russia worked for peace is set forth in the following statement: —

Announcement by the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs respecting Recent Events

July 20 (August 2), 1914.

Simultaneously, the Russian Government declared that Russia was ready to continue discussions with a view to a

peaceful settlement of the dispute, either in the form of direct negotiations with Vienna or, as suggested by Great Britain, in the form of a conference of the four great powers not directly interested; that is to say, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy.

Nevertheless, Russia did not abandon her efforts for peace. When questioned by the German Ambassador as to the conditions on which we would still agree to suspend our preparations, the Minister for Foreign Affairs declared that these conditions were Austria's recognition that the Austro-Servian question had assumed a European character, and a declaration by her that she agreed not to insist upon such of her demands as were incompatible with the sovereign rights of Servia.

Germany considered this Russian proposal unacceptable to Austria-Hungary. At that very moment news of the proclamation of general mobilization by Austria-Hungary reached St. Petersburg.

In the extracts I made in chapter 14 from the article introductory to the dispatches from the Belgian Ministers at Berlin, London, and Paris, 1905 to 1914, there are the most bewildering statements, assuming that England had craftily engineered a war on Germany.

This was in no sense England's war. England, Russia, France, and Italy wanted the trouble between Austria-Hungary and Servia to be settled by a conference of England, Germany, France, and Italy. Germany wanted England to restrain Russia while she gave Austria a free hand.

England could influence Russia to submit to arbitration. She could not restrain Russia from declaring war against Austria, unless Austria would suspend her war against Servia. It would have been easier for Germany to have restrained Austria from declaring war on Servia. This Germany found to be impossible.

I conclude that the German Government tried to avoid war. That Von Bethmann-Hollweg, Herr von Jagow, and Herr Zimmermann, supported by the Kaiser, worked for peace. They failed because they tried the impossible (permitting Austria to war on Servia and expecting Russia to remain quiescent). They tried the impossible because they did not understand the psychology of other nations — what Bismarck called the "imponderables." They believed with the Austro-Hungarian Government that a firm attitude would restrain Russia, just as their military chiefs believe that terrorism is in the long run the most merciful policy.

Nations are often blamed, because their chiefs, ministers, or ambassadors fail by misjudging what will be the effect of certain words or acts on the minds of other peoples. Bismarck was a master in dealing with the public opinion of other nations. George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Charles Francis Adams, United States Minister to England during the Civil War, John Hay, Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt, were all masters in this field.

I was constantly told in Germany that the Germans did not know how to present their case to the world as well as their enemies. They said, "Our enemies can influence the neutrals better than we can." That is true, but the reason is not what Germany thinks. Germany failed so largely to win the approval of the neutral world because her words and her acts had a different influence from what she expected. The German officials expected different results from their policy.

Before Austria sent the note to Servia, the German

Government took a position that showed an incredible misunderstanding of the effect of the note on Russia. The views of Von Jagow are given in this dispatch: —

Sir H. Rumbold, British Chargé d'Affaires at Berlin, to Sir Edward Grey (Received July 22)

(Telegraphic.) *Berlin, July 22, 1914.*

Last night I met Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the forthcoming Austrian *démarche* at Belgrade was alluded to by His Excellency in the conversation that ensued. He insisted that the question at issue was one for settlement between Servia and Austria alone, and that there should be no interference from outside in the discussions between those two countries. He had therefore considered it inadvisable that the Austro-Hungarian Government should be approached by the German Government on the matter. [Extract.]

The aim of England and the feeling in Russia are explained very clearly in the dispatch from the British Ambassador in Russia to Sir Edward Grey on Saturday, July 25, as follows: —

Sir G. Buchanan, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, to Sir Edward Grey (Received July 25)

(Telegraphic.) *St. Petersburg, July 25, 1914.*

On my expressing the earnest hope that Russia would not precipitate war by mobilizing until you had had time to use your influence in favor of peace, His Excellency assured me that Russia had no aggressive intentions, and she would take no action until it was forced upon her. Austria's action was in reality directed against Russia. She aimed at overthrowing the present *status quo* in the Balkans, and establishing her own hegemony there. He did not believe that Germany really wanted war, but her attitude was decided by ours. If we took our stand firmly with France and Russia

there would be no war. If we failed them now, rivers of blood would flow, and we would in the end be dragged into war.

I said that England could play the rôle of mediator at Berlin and Vienna to better purpose as a friend who, if her counsels of moderation were disregarded, might one day be converted into an ally, than if she were to declare herself Russia's ally at once. His Excellency said that unfortunately Germany was convinced that she could count upon our neutrality. [Extract.]

On the same day, Sir Edward Grey urged the same advice on the German Ambassador in London, as is seen from this dispatch: —

Sir Edward Grey to Sir H. Rumbold, British Chargé d'Affaires at Berlin

(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, July 25, 1914.*

I impressed upon the Ambassador that, in the event of Russian and Austrian mobilization, the participation of Germany would be essential to any diplomatic action for peace. Alone we could do nothing. [Extract.]

Still later, on the 27th of July, England is urging moderation on Russia, as is seen in a dispatch from the British Ambassador in St. Petersburg to Sir Edward Grey as follows: —

Sir G. Buchanan, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg to Sir Edward Grey (Received July 27)

(Telegraphic.) *St. Petersburg, July 27, 1914.*

On the Minister for Foreign Affairs questioning me, I told him that I had correctly defined the attitude of His Majesty's Government in my conversation with him, which I reported in my telegram of the 24th instant. I added that you could not promise to do anything more, and that His

Excellency was mistaken if he believed that the cause of peace could be promoted by our telling the German Government that they would have to deal with us as well as with Russia and France if they supported Austria by force of arms. Their attitude would merely be stiffened by such a menace, and we could only induce her to use her influence at Vienna to avert war by approaching her in the capacity of a friend who was anxious to preserve peace. His Excellency must not, if our efforts were to be successful, do anything to precipitate a conflict. In these circumstances I trusted that the Russian Government would defer mobilization ukase for as long as possible, and that troops would not be allowed to cross the frontier even when it was issued. [Extract.]

Sir Edward Grey had already sent his approval of the course pursued by the British Ambassador in St. Petersburg from the beginning of the negotiations, as is seen from this dispatch: —

Sir Edward Grey to Sir G. Buchanan, British Ambassador at St. Petersburg

(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, July 25, 1914.*

You spoke quite rightly in very difficult circumstances as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government. I entirely approve what you said, as reported in your telegram of yesterday, and I cannot promise more on behalf of the Government. [Extract.]

Sir Edward Grey explained clearly why England went into the war, in his address to Parliament August 3: —

The issues at stake

I ask the House, from the point of view of British interests, to consider what may be at stake. If France is beaten in a struggle of life and death, beaten to her knees, loses her position as a great power, becomes subordinate to the will

and power of one greater than herself, — consequences which I do not anticipate, because I am sure that France has the power to defend herself with all the energy and ability and patriotism which she has shown so often, — still, if that were to happen, and if Belgium fell under the same dominating influence, and then Holland and then Denmark, then would not Mr. Gladstone's words come true, that just opposite to us there would be a common interest against the unmeasured aggrandizement of any power?

It may be said, I suppose, that we might stand aside, husband our strength, and that, whatever happened in the course of this war, at the end of it intervene with effect to put things right and to adjust them to our own point of view. If in a crisis like this we ran away from those obligations of honor and interests as regards the Belgian Treaty, I doubt whether, whatever material force we might have at the end, it would be of very much value in face of the respect that we should have lost. At the end of the war, whether we have stood aside or whether we have been engaged in it, I do not believe for a moment — even if we had stood aside and remained aside — that we should be in a position, a material position, to use our force decisively to undo what had happened in the course of the war, to prevent the whole of the west of Europe, opposite to us, if that had been the result of the war, falling under the domination of a single power, and I am quite sure that our moral position would be such as to have lost all respect.

Sir Edward Grey was largely instrumental in preserving the peace of Europe during the Balkan wars, not merely because he was just, not merely because he was conciliatory, not merely because he was truthful, but also because he understood the psychology of other nations. From the very beginning he saw that if Austria persisted in her course a European war was almost inevitable. He realized the danger of giving either side a free hand so far as England was concerned.

We know from very high sources the impression Sir Edward Grey had made on the Governments of Europe.

In an address in the Reichstag on April 7, 1913, Von Bethmann-Hollweg said: —

> Europe will feel grateful to the English Minister of Foreign Affairs for the extraordinary ability and spirit of conciliation with which he conducted the discussions in London, and which constantly enabled him to reconcile divergencies of view. Germany shares all the more sincerely in this gratitude, because she knows herself to be at one with the aims of English policy, and, standing loyally by her allies, has labored in the same sense.

In an address before the Austro-Hungarian Delegations, in November, 1913, Count Berchtold, the Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary, said: —

> All Europe can find are words of gratitude and recognition for Sir Edward Grey, and the distinctly objective course of British foreign policy which has greatly assisted in making possible the removal of numberless difficulties in the situation without serious discord being thereby produced.

I believe that the verdict of history on the work of Sir Edward Grey during the fatal thirteen days will rank him as the foremost statesman of his time.

CHAPTER VI

WHY DID GERMANY INVADE BELGIUM?

It would have seemed to a detached and well-informed observer on August 1, 1914, that the invasion of Belgium by Germany would surely cause England to go to war.

The negotiations of 1912, in which Lord Haldane was so active and which are explained in the third chapter of this book, revealed very definitely England's views as to the neutrality of Belgium. Also, when the Franco-Prussian War broke out, in 1870, Her Majesty Queen Victoria's Government sent an identical question to the Emperor of France and to the King of Prussia, as to whether or not either would violate the neutrality of Belgium. Later the British Government made an identical treaty with each of the two belligerents. I give herewith an extract from the treaty between Great Britain and Prussia. All the world knew that it would be very difficult for the most pacific Government to keep England out of a war that involved the violation of Belgium's neutrality.

Coöperation of Great Britain with Prussia in case of violation of Neutrality of Belgium by France

Article 1. His Majesty the King of Prussia having declared that, notwithstanding the Hostilities in which the North German Confederation is engaged with France, it is his fixed determination to respect the Neutrality of Belgium, so long as the same shall be respected by France, Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Ireland on her part declares that, if during the said Hostilities the Armies of France should violate that Neutrality, she will be prepared to coöperate with His Prussian Majesty for the defence of the same in such a manner as may be mutually agreed upon, employing for that purpose her Naval and Military Forces to insure its observance, and to maintain, in conjunction with His Prussian Majesty, then and thereafter, the Independence and Neutrality of Belgium.

But could Britain keep out of the war, even if Belgium were not in question? Hardly. War breaks out. Great Britain during the years of naval competition with Germany had massed nearly all her navy in the North Sea. France had undertaken to make good in the Mediterranean the withdrawal of England's warships from thence and, in return, England had agreed to protect the northern coasts of France, which France had denuded when she massed her naval armaments in the Mediterranean. Further, public opinion in England would not let England stand aside while France was being crushed.

The moment that war should break out, Germany would endeavor to hinder France's export and import trade. In a month or two, England must have come in. No one can doubt this who remembers the diplomatic events of the last two years and a half between the United States and Germany.

If England were sure to enter the war in any event, what would be the chances of her coming in earlier if Belgium were invaded? And even if she came in immediately, would not the advantages of attacking France through Belgium greatly outweigh the benefit to France of Britain's immediately entering the war?

The genuine surprise of Von Bethmann-Hollweg,

and in fact of the masses of the German people, shows that Germany did not count on the immediate entrance of Great Britain into the war.

I was in London from July 15 to July 25, 1914. Already I had spent a month in Ireland visiting many places, seeing many people. For one week I had the good fortune to travel with Lord Northcliffe, and was able to learn a great deal through the facilities he commanded.

Civil war in Ireland seemed certain and when the King called the conference to meet in Buckingham Palace, he used the words *civil war* in his proclamation. This conference failed. England's preoccupation was serious.

Further, even should England immediately enter the war, it could make but slight difference. From a military standpoint, England was almost as negligible as the United States. What would a hundred thousand troops signify in a contest in which millions would be engaged on each side?

The advantages to Germany, on the other hand, of an advance through Belgium would be incalculable.

First, she could probably in less than six weeks envelop the armies of France and capture Paris. With her knowledge of the military situation and of the armaments of Germany and France, nothing was more absolutely certain to Germany than that her armies would be in Paris by the middle of September. And any student of the war to-day with the knowledge then available to the Germans would regard their belief as absolutely sound.

The military condition in France was well known in Germany. Moreover, on July 13, an address to the

French Senate by Senator Humbert revealed France's military shortcomings. I quote from a dispatch that appeared in the London "Times," July 14, 1914: —

Startling disclosures in the Senate to-day with regard to the deficient organization and administration of the Army were rendered still more dramatic by the intervention of M. Clemenceau, who demanded an immediate reply from the War Minister. The House is expected to sit to-morrow, National Fête day, in order to continue the debate.

The disclosures were made by M. Charles Humbert, Senator from the Meuse, in submitting his report on the special report for *matériel*. This speech was as scathing an indictment of a public department as has been heard in the French Parliament.

Forts, he said, were defective in structure; guns lacked ammunition, and the men were without boots. There was no provision for the defense of fortifications against attacks from the air, and the wireless installation for communicating from fort to fort was inadequate. When the German wireless installation at Metz was working, the Verdun station ceased to receive messages. The French artillery was rapidly falling behind that of Germany. So-called improvements were themselves obsolete by the time they had been discussed and adopted. As for the boots of the Army, the supply was two million short of requirements. If war broke out, the men would have to take the field with one pair of boots and only one reserve boot in their knapsack, and that one thirty years old.

There must, he concluded, be a complete reorganization of the whole business of military administration, which at present suffered from an extreme instability of government.

M. Messimy, the Minister of War, said he could not reply to the indictment on the spur of the moment; whereupon M. Clemenceau exclaimed, "The country has a right to know how its money has been spent; we must have an immediate reply."

The Minister of War, amid great excitement, then admitted that the majority of the accusations made by M.

Humbert were accurate, taken by themselves. They were, however, only accurate as exceptions, and not as the rule.

The great plan of the German General Staff was simplicity itself. Germany's military forces would be placed on the Franco-German frontier in sufficient numbers to protect against invasion and occupy the bulk of the French military forces. Meanwhile an overwhelming army of over a million of the best-equipped soldiers in the world would sweep through Belgium, drive the French forces west and south, envelop them, achieve a Sedan on a colossal scale, and take Paris at its leisure.

But the French do not give up easily, and with the Loire as a new front, France might carry on the war, thereby delaying victory and adding heavily to the cost of the war and also giving time for England to come in.

But by invading France through Belgium, Germany did more than win a battle. Modern war requires munitions on a gigantic scale. Modern war is a war of metallurgy. Nearly all the iron and coal mines of France and three fourths of her steel mills are in the northeast. When Germany intrenched after the battle of the Marne, she controlled most of the mineral resources — and hence most of the raw materials for munitions — of France. The war was won if France could not get materials by sea, and there was the submarine.

The enormous increase in Germany's resources and the starvation of France's industries rendered France absolutely unable to manufacture sufficient munitions, the more so as more than a third of all her manufacturing plants were in Germany's possession.

Further, the crops raised in the part of France occupied by the German armies are not applied to the needs of the inhabitants. They are taken by the German Government. When I was in Mannheim, in April, 1916, I was told by Herr Hirsch, president of the Corn Exchange, that he had a day or two before dealt with one thousand tons of wheat shipped from French territory occupied by the Germans.

Iron ore from the French mines is mined far in excess of the consumption of the mills, and is stored up in Germany. The forests are cut down and the lumber shipped to Germany.

It is estimated by the French Government that it will require two and a half billion dollars to restore the part of France occupied by the German army. This does not include the loss to France from the exploitation of her mines of iron ore and coal, nor from the destruction of her forests.

The Eastern frontier of France runs through the middle of the Lorraine iron deposits; and nine tenths of the metallurgical industries of the whole of France are concentrated in the Briey Basin just across the frontier from Germany. If, the Germans argued, the Briey Basin were seized at the beginning of the war, the French would have lost more than a battle, because they would be deprived of the means of recuperation, and the Germans, on their part, would have gained "a victory without a morrow."

. . . France, though victorious [writes M. Engerand], found herself nevertheless without munitions and material, and without the means of producing them in the quantities made requisite by the turn which the war was taking — deprived of 90 per cent of her iron ore, 68 per cent of her coal,

86 per cent of her resources for the production of cast iron, and 76 per cent of her power of turning out steel and iron plates. Of 127 blast furnaces in active operation in 1913, 95 were in the war zone and in the possession of the enemy. She had, besides, been obliged to abandon to Germany enormous stocks of cast iron, steel billets, and iron plates. At Valenciennes, the Germans found immense supplies of horseshoes, of which they then stood very much in need.

The Germans, no less than ourselves, realized that fact, as appears from a confidential memorandum addressed to Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, on May 20, 1915, by the representatives of six important industrial associations:—

> The manufacture of our shells calls for iron and steel in quantities hitherto unsuspected. Merely for the shells of *fonte grise*, which are inferior substitutes for the shells of *fonte d'acier* and *acier étiré*, we have required, during the last few months, 4000 tons of iron per day. If our production of iron and steel had not been doubled since last August, it would have been impossible to continue the war. As raw material for the manufacture of these immense quantities of iron and steel, the "minette" [i.e., the ore of the Lorraine mines] takes a place of continually increasing importance; for this is the only ore which we can get out of our mines in continually increasing quantities. From 60 to 80 per cent of our iron and steel is, at present, being made from the minette. If the production of the minette were interrupted, the war would be as good as lost.

"The economic production of France," said Herr Schrodter, at the annual general meeting of the Verein Eisenhuttenleuter, "is seriously damaged, and, indeed, in a large measure annihilated."

By invading Belgium, Germany secured immeasurable advantages, incalculable because she at once increased her coal and iron resources so that her production was enormously increased, and most impor-

tant of all, she crippled France at the very source for the manufacture of munitions. But this was not all. She stripped the Belgian and French mills and factories of all raw materials as well as of all useful machinery. Belgium and occupied France have thus been a source of great strength to Germany, at less than no expense.

In a petition to the German Government to take territory from France, and to control Belgium economically after the war, six influential associations gave a statement of the enormous value of the territory occupied. The names of the associations which organized the petition are as follows: Bund der Landwirte (Farmers' League), Deutsche Bauern Verband (German Peasants' Union), Vorort der Christlichen Bauernvereine (the Executive of the Christian Peasants' Union), Zentral Verband Deutscher Industrieller (Central Association of German Manufacturers), Bund Deutscher Industrieller (the Union of German Manufacturers), and the Reichsdeutsche Mittelstands-Verband (Imperial German Middle-Class Association).

The present war must be followed by a peace concluded with honor answering to the sacrifices made and containing in itself the guarantee of its endurance.

Our only guarantee consists in an economic and military enfeeblement of our adversaries, such that, thanks to it, peace will be insured for a period as long as can be taken into consideration.

Because it is necessary to assure our credit on the sea, and our military and economical situation for the future in relation to England, because the Belgian territory, economically so important, is closely connected with our own principal industrial territory, Belgium, in matters monetary, financial, and postal, must be subjected to the legislation of the

Empire. Her railways and waterways must be closely bound up with our own communications. By constituting a Walloon territory and a territory preponderatingly Flemish, and by putting into German hands the enterprises and the economical properties so important in dominating the country, we shall organize the government and the administration in such a manner that the inhabitants shall be able to acquire no influence on the political destinies of the German Empire.

As to France, always having in view our situation with relation to the English, it is of vital interest to us, in view of our future on the sea, that we should possess the coastal region adjoining Belgium very nearly as far as the Somme which will give us an opening from the Atlantic Ocean. The hinterland, which must be acquired at the same time, must have such an extent that economically and strategically the ports to which lead the canals may be able to take their full importance. Every other territorial conquest of France, outside of the necessary annexation of the mining basins of Briey, must be made only from considerations of military strategy. In this respect, after the experiences of this war, it is very natural that we should not expose our frontiers to new hostile invasions by leaving to the adversary the fortresses which threaten us, especially Verdun and Belfort, and the western ramparts of the Vosges, situated between those two fortresses. By the conquest of the line of the Meuse and of the French coast with the mouths of the canals, we should acquire from her, besides the iron ore regions of Briey already indicated, the coal territories of the Departments of the North and of the Pas-de-Calais. These territorial augmentations suppose that the population of the annexed territories shall not be in a position to attain any political influence over the destinies of the German Empire, and that all the means of economic power existing in these territories, including moderate and large properties, shall pass into German hands; France shall indemnify the property-owners and shall receive them.

This with the coast-line will enable use to be made of the canals and enable the ports at the mouth of the canals to

assume their full importance. The security of the German Empire in a future war imperiously calls for all the beds of minerals, including the fortresses of Longwy and of Verdun, without which these mineral beds cannot be protected. The possession of great quantities of coal, and especially of coal rich in bitumen, which abounds in the basin of the North of France, is, at least in as great measure as iron ore, decisive for the issue of the war. Belgium and the North of France together produce more than forty millions of tons.

The value of the territory Germany secured from France in 1871 is indicated in a statement by Otto Hue, Socialist Member of the Reichstag: —

Of the 34,000,000 tons of iron ore worked up in German smelters and foundries in 1913, some 23,250,000 tons came from the interior of the Empire, and as of that only about 7,000,000 tons were produced outside of Alsace-Lorraine, a simple calculation shows that already in 1913 some 70 per cent of the German iron ore used came from Lorraine.

What France lost is clearly stated by Henri Bérenger, Member of the French Senate: —

There is no reason to be astonished that Germany, from the very beginning of the war, has sought to maintain possession of the Basin of Briey, which represented 90 per cent of our iron production, and that the attack on Verdun has been for the purpose of confirming and perpetuating this possession.

Before the war Germany produced annually 28,000,000 tons of iron, of which 21,000,000 tons came from that part of the Basin of Briey which had been annexed to Germany since 1870–71.

France produced annually 22,000,000 tons of iron, of which 15,000,000 tons came from the part of the Basin of Briey which had remained French. . . .

Since the war began France, having lost the Basin of Briey through invasion, has been almost exclusively furnished with iron from England and America.

Germany, on the contrary, having occupied at the same time the Basin of Briey in France and in Luxemburg, has put in operation nearly all the great furnaces there and thus adds to her 28,000,000 tons, before the war, the 15,000,000 tons of our basin and the 6,000,000 of the Basin of Luxemburg — that is, 28 plus 15 plus 6, making 49,000,000 tons of iron for herself and her allies.

Germany has at her disposition about 45,000,000 tons of ore for military and naval appliances of all sorts.

We have left Germany in possession of 90 per cent of our French production of iron and of 80 per cent of the national production of steel we had before the war.

Here, notably, is what one may read since May 20, 1915, in the "Confidential Memorandum on the Conditions of Future Peace," which was addressed to Von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of the Empire, by the six great industrial and agricultural associations of Germany: —

> If the production of pig iron and steel had not been doubled since August, 1914, the continuation of the war would have been impossible. At present the mineral of Briey furnishes from 60 to 80 per cent of the appliances made from iron and steel. If this production be disturbed the war will be practically lost.

British and French naval and mercantile power overcame the tremendous handicap under which France suffered.

France had to import coal, iron, and steel, had to make an enormous increase in manufacturing facilities, and at the same time wage a colossal war.

The Question of Alsace-Lorraine: a Footnote

I will here give data furnished me by Mr. Sawhill, associate editor of "The Iron Trade Review," Cleveland. Mr. Penton, the publisher, had just spent several months in France, studying the industrial situa-

tion. These statistics as to production of iron ore are the latest available, and are for 1913, the last year before the war: —

Germany (of which Alsace-Lorraine produces 21,136,265)	28,607,903
France (of which Briey Basin produces 12,699,240 for 1912)	21,714,000
England	15,997,328
United States	61,980,437

From this table it will be seen that three fourths of the iron ore mined in Germany comes from Alsace-Lorraine. According to these statistics if France gets back Alsace-Lorraine the production of iron ore in Germany would be 7,471,638 tons and in France 42,850,265 tons. Should Germany keep the Briey Basin which she now holds, the production in Germany would be 41,307,143 tons, and in France 9,014,760 tons.

In quoting from various authorities I have not tried to reduce the statements to identical terms as to territory and tonnage. The statistics given herewith are accurate if we deal with what is known in France as the Briey Basin. The settlement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine is not as simple as if it were a mere matter of scenery.

CHAPTER VII

THE SPOLIATION OF BELGIUM

On Friday, July 31, 1914, Von Bethmann-Hollweg telegraphed to the German Embassy in St. Petersburg, as follows: —

> In spite of negotiations still pending and although we have up to this hour made no preparations for mobilization, Russia has mobilized her entire army and navy, hence also against us.

From this dispatch and from a similar one sent to Paris on the same day, we learn that Germany had not mobilized before Saturday, August 1, 1914. At 7 P.M. August 2, on Sunday, the German Minister at Brussels, Herr von Below, informed the Belgian Government of the purpose of the German Government of invading France by way of Belgium.

This notwithstanding that already, on August 1, the French Minister at Brussels had made the following verbal communication to the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs: —

> I am authorized to declare that in the event of an international conflict the Government of the Republic will, as it has always declared, respect the neutrality of Belgium. In the event of this neutrality not being respected by another power, the French Government, in order to insure its own defense, might be led to modify its attitude.

I deal with the entire subject of the neutrality of Belgium in chapter 14.

On the 4th of August, in the Reichstag, in the course of his address, Von Bethmann-Hollweg said: —

Gentlemen, we are now in a position of necessity [energetic assent]; and necessity knows no law. (*Not kennt kein Gebot.*) [Energetic applause.] Our troops have occupied Luxemburg [energetic "Bravo"]; perhaps they have already entered Belgian territory. [Energetic applause.] Gentlemen, this is in contradiction to the rules of international law. The French Government has declared in Brussels that it is willing to respect the neutrality of Belgium so long as it is respected by the enemy. But we knew that France stood prepared for an inroad. ["Hear, hear," from right.] France could wait, but we could not. A French inroad on our flank on the Lower Rhine could have been fatal to us. [Energetic assent.] So we were forced to set aside the just protests of the Luxemburg and Belgian Governments. ["Quite right!"] The wrong — I speak openly — the wrong that we now do we will try to make good again as soon as our military ends have been reached. When one is threatened as we are, and all is at stake, he can only think of how he can hack his way out. [Long, stormy applause and clapping from all sides of the House.]

In regard to the statement of Von Bethmann-Hollweg that he knew "France stood prepared for an inroad" (through Belgium), one can only say that so far as indicated by the facts and all available documents, Von Bethmann-Hollweg was misinformed by the military authorities of Germany.

The fate of the Belgians and of the Armenians will stand out as the two greatest tragedies of the war.

Belgium has about one fourteenth the population and one fourteenth the wealth of the United States, the *per capita* wealth being about the same. But Belgium produces less than one third of the food it requires. It is a country rich in coal and iron. Its foreign trade is

enormous for its size. If the foreign trade of the United States were correspondingly as large as the foreign trade of Belgium, it would be twenty billions a year. Belgium had a population equal to that of Canada, a territory less than one third that of the State of Illinois, and a foreign trade equal to that of all South America.

Immediately on invading Belgium, the German Government seized all the raw materials in the great manufacturing centers, and not only that, but all the valuable machinery in the mills and factories of Belgium. To replace the private property thus confiscated will require several hundreds of millions of dollars.

Further, heavy requisitions were made for other materials for the army and heavy fines were levied on cities and provinces, and later the deposits of the largest banks were requisitioned. It is estimated, counting the ten million dollars a month that Germany collects from Belgium to pay for the army of occupation, that the amount of raw materials, machinery, other supplies and money that Germany has taken from Belgium reaches a total in excess of one billion dollars, *or nearly five times as much as all the world has contributed to keep the Belgian people from starving to death.*

The thoroughness of the search by the military authorities for all useful supplies is illustrated by such proclamations as the following, posted at Grivegnée, September 6, 1914: —

Any one knowing of the location of a store of more than one hundred litres of petroleum, benzine, benzol, or other similar liquids in the aforesaid communes, and who does not report same to the military commander on the spot, incurs

the penalty of death, provided there is no doubt about the quantity and location of the store. Quantities of one hundred litres are alone referred to.

(Signed) DIECKMANN, *Major in Command.*

Here is an illustrative incident from a German newspaper: [1]—

. . . A château stands beside the highway, at the back of a courtyard protected by a French spear-headed railing. It is intact, and shelters the staff of an infantry regiment. Facing it is the ruined façade of an incredibly pretentious building on whose pediment sprawls in letters of gold the one word, "Bank." Beside it is a wholesale corn-chandler's and a wholesale wine-merchant's. All this belonged to a single man. It was necessary to shoot him as hostage, because the French were persisting, despite all warnings, in throwing shells into the neighborhood. In the wine-cellars stores of unexpected importance were found: according to the estimates there are more than half a million litres of red and white wine of very good quality. A great part of the wine was pumped out of the tanks and received, like an old acquaintance, by the comrades far and near.

The rich man of this quarter of the town had a companion who was more lucky, who in due time sought safety in flight.

Here is a proclamation which shows another method of using the resources of Belgium: —

By order of His Excellency the Inspector de l'Étape, I call the attention of the commune to the following: —

The attitude of certain factories which, under pretext of patriotism and relying on the Hague Convention, have refused to work for the German Army, proves that there are, in the midst of the population, tendencies whose object is to place difficulties in the way of the administration of the German army.

In this connection I make it known that I shall repress, by all the means at my disposal, such behavior, which can

[1] The *Kölnische Zeitung*, February 21, 1915.

only disturb the good understanding hitherto existing between the administration of the German army and the population.

In the first place, I hold the Communal authorities responsible for the spread of such tendencies, and I call attention to the fact that the population will itself be responsible if the liberties hitherto accorded in the most ample measure are withdrawn and replaced by the restrictive measures necessitated by its own fault.

Lieutenant-General GRAF VON WESTARP,
Commandant de l'Étape.

June 19, 1915.

The German justification of her acts in Belgium are to be found in her laws of war: —

The law of requisitions *has no other limits than the exhaustion, impoverishment, and destruction of the country.*

Von Hartmann completes and defines this: —

The system of requisitions goes indefinitely beyond the simple right to collect provisions in the country where war is carried on. It implies the full exploitation of that country *in all respects* and whatever the assistance which one is able to promise one's self from it for the army operating there, whether to facilitate and advance its actions, or to promote its endurance and ensure its safety.

This implies, be it noted, that *military necessities must not establish any distinction between public and private property* and that the army claims the right to take what it requires everywhere and in such a manner as it can appropriate it.

The seizure of enemy territory is a matter of course, "not always," Clausewitz says, "with the intention of keeping it, but to levy war contributions upon it, *merely in order to lay it waste.*" It is necessary that a cry of distress should arise from invaded countries. Julius von Hartmann adds: —

Distress, the deep misery of war, must not be spared to the enemy State. The burden must be and must remain crushing. The necessity of imposing it follows from the very idea of national war. . . .

That individuals may be severely affected, when one makes an example of them intended to serve as a deterrent, is truly deplorable for them. But for the people as a whole, this severity exercised against individuals is a salutary blessing. When national war has broken out, *terrorism* becomes a principle which is necessary from a military standpoint.

Professor Massart, dealing with the principal causes of famine in Belgium, says: —

Let us consider briefly the principal causes of the famine which prevails in Belgium.

1. Exaggerated requisitions, out of all proportion to the resources of the country. They are of two kinds: —

Firstly, those which have emptied the country of grain, cattle, forage, and other foodstuffs.

Then the requisitions of the raw materials intended for the factories, which have completely paralyzed industry, especially in Flanders. One example will suffice: All the workshops of Termonde were burned save one — the Escaut-Dendre establishment, which makes boots and shoes. But the Germans sent into Germany both the leather and the shoes which were in the warehouse. The factory is thus condemned to stand idle for lack of raw material, and also for lack of funds. Those industries the machinery of which has been removed are also, of course, doomed to paralysis.

2. Having made a clean sweep of the greater portion of all that was indispensable to us, the Germans have been careful to take our money from us. Under every imaginable pretext, and often without any pretext at all, they have imposed crushing taxes upon us. The regular payment of these taxes showing that the public coffers were not yet quite empty, the Germans hastened to impose fines upon us, which vary from five francs to five millions. The private banks, too, are

threatened every moment with the removal of a portion of their funds.

By Germany our country was condemned to perish of starvation. The miracle which alone could save us has been effected by the charity of Spain, Scandinavia, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and above all, the United States.

What are we to say, for example, of the placard posted at Menin, in July, 1915, by order of the Commandant Schmidt, in which it is ordained that the families of those "who do not work regularly on the military works" shall be allowed to die of starvation? —

ORDER

> From to-day the town can no longer grant relief — of whatever kind, even for families, women and children — save only to those workmen who are working regularly on the military works and on other works prescribed.
>
> All other workmen and their families cannot henceforth be assisted in any way whatever.

One of the most interesting men I met in Germany was Dr. Rathenau, son of the founder of the famous A.E.G. (the General Electric Company of Germany). He gave me a pamphlet describing his work in connection with the war. Dr. Rathenau suggested to the Government the necessity for a census of all raw materials that had to do with war. He was at once authorized to undertake this work. The pamphlet he gave me is a report of a speech he made on the work of the bureau he organized. I quote from it: —

It was first of all necessary to assure ourselves by all possible means an increase of the reserves of crude materials, as well by purchases in neutral countries, as by the seizing of stores found in the occupied countries. The occupation of Belgium, of the part of France industrially most important,

as well as of parts of the Western territory, brought new material of labor to the *Deutsche Kriegsrohstoffabteilung*. It was necessary to utilize the stocks of crude material of these three territories for the national economy of the war, especially the reserves found in the centers of the continental wool market; also the important reserves of rubber and of saltpetre must be made available to the profit of the national manufactures. A network of centers of expedition, of dépôts, and of organizations of distribution, was established; the difficulties of transportation were removed; new blood, rendering our vitality greater and more enduring, was infused in the national industry.

A more detailed and equally authoritative account of the German utilization of private property in Belgium is given in a series of articles appearing February, 1915, in the "Neueste Nachrichten" of Munich. These articles were prepared by a special envoy, Dr. Ludwig Ganghofer. Dealing with the German administration in Belgium and France, he says: —

The entire work is accomplished in virtue of the principle: to bring the least possible from Germany for the needs of the army; to draw the most possible from the conquered enemy country; and everything which is superfluous for the army, but which can be utilized at home, to send it into Germany.

In three months the conquered country has covered four fifths of the needs of the army. Even now, although the available resources of the country occupied by us are becoming scarcer, the conquered country still covers two thirds of the needs of our Army of the West. By that means, according to a moderate estimation, a saving for Germany is accomplished of three millions and a half to four million marks a day.

This profit of the German victory is further notably increased by the profits of the economic war carried on in conformity to the prescriptions of international law against the conquered territory, that is to say, by the utilization of

the property of the State transported in enormous quantities from Belgium and the North of France, into Germany, — such as booty of war, provisionings of fortresses, cereals, wools, metals, precious woods and other products, with the exception of all private property not requisitioned, which can be seized in case of necessity to increase German provisionments, but which will be also paid for at its entire value. What Germany saves and gains by this economic war directed in a commercial spirit, can be computed daily to six or seven more millions of marks, so that the total profit realized by the German Empire behind the Western front, since the beginning of the war, may be counted at about two billions [marks]; which is for Germany a glorious victory, represented by the saving and the increase of its economic power; and for the enemy, a crushing defeat, corresponding to the exhaustion of all financial resources of the territory which we have seized. [This was during the first six months of the war.]

Dr. Ganghofer continues: —

I shall have again to refer to the ramifications and to the direction of this economic war. Men will thus learn to discard the expression of "impractical Germans."

I was told that it is customary when the German authorities take private property to give the owner an order for the value of the property, but this order is to be made good by the French Government in the case of French citizens and by the Belgian Government, or by England and France, in the case of Belgian citizens.

In the German "Official Monitor," published at Brussels, are a host of orders of seizures, taxations, collections, inventories, declarations, authorizations, restrictions, interdictions, etc. Industry, commerce, agriculture, finances, labor, everything is here passed through the sieve, fanned, ventilated, levied upon, successively and iteratively, with an application, a per-

severance, and an activity equally devouring. It is as if a swarm of grasshoppers had settled upon the country and had eaten it bare. The German colonial science has an expressive word to define this particular method of exploitation to the limit; it calls it "the political economy of exhaustion" (*Raubswirtschaft*).

It is impossible, for lack of space, to give detailed and complete enumeration of the objects of these measures. Beginning with the order of October 26, 1914, authorizing the "Commissary of the Ministry of War" to requisition forty-four articles (crude materials), completed by that of November 15, 1914 (eighteen new articles), and by that of December 20, 1914 (seventeen articles more), there were seized in Belgium on order: thousands of machines, of tool machines, especially of American engines impossible to replace, pieces of machines; metals, especially copper, which was taken away from a quantity of industrial installations, thus rendering them unusable; lubricating oils, petroleum, and benzine; stocks of wool, of flax, of jute, of cotton, of threads of all kinds, in this way obliging all the spinning and weaving mills of the country to close their doors, unless their administrations would consent to work for the German army. All this not yet being enough, they proceeded to the seizure or the mobilization of rubber, of tires of autos and of velocipedes, transmission belting, steel parts, automobiles, locomotives, motors of all kinds, machines for manufacturing wood, building-lumber, walnut trees, poplar trees, horses, leathers and hides, even to and including the skins of rabbits and cats, cloths of wool, cotton, and silk, ribbons, bonneterie, passementerie, etc.

Among interdictions or restrictions of the right to import, we find them in regard to materials or products of which Belgium is in need, but of which Germany wishes to reserve for herself the quantities to be had in neutral countries.

"Le Temps" of January 5, 1915, publishes the following extract from the "Frankfurter Zeitung": —

> The goods of different sorts seized in the enemies' territories are in such large quantities that the difficulty of knowing where to put them increases day by day. At the request of the Prussian Minister of War all Chambers of Commerce have been asked to give all possible information with regard to storehouses, sheds, etc., which could be used temporarily to warehouse the spoil.

From the month of December, 1914, the Belgian provinces were solidly subjected to a permanent and monthly war contribution of forty millions of francs a month, in addition to the ordinary imposts maintained in their entirety and increased in certain respects. The German authorities refusing on principle to accept payment in marks, the contribution had to be paid chiefly in Belgian francs. After having brought to Germany nearly a billion francs, this contribution has been increased by ten million francs a month, and brought thus to the amount of fifty millions of francs (orders of November 20, 1916). Add to this: the imposition of the mark at a forced minimum value of 1 fr. 25; the imposition of the settlement in marks of the part of the requisitions which was paid in money; the absolute interdiction of the exportation of money even to pay for the provisions necessary for feeding the civil population.

When all these measures had produced their natural

and inevitable effect: the inflation of the marks and their engorgement in the institutions of emission (National Bank and General Society), the German authorities undertook to appropriate to themselves this fund of savings; they opened a campaign of summations and of intimidation (the arbitrary arrest and deportation of Director Carlier), and finally forced the banks to give up the keys of their vaults by imposing on them the ultimatum of forced and immediate liquidation. This extortion permitted the German authorities to transfer for forced investment in Germany more than four hundred and thirty millions of marks, the property of the two banks, which are private companies and not State institutions.

When I was in Belgium last February (1916) I was told by an unusually well-informed German officer that Belgium was ruined. The finances and currency of Belgium are not quite so badly ruined as those of Mexico, but have suffered in somewhat the same way.

The removal of machinery from her factories is a vital blow, as Belgium is mainly a manufacturing nation. The money and property taken from Belgium represent the greater part of the movable resources of the country. If the United States had been robbed in two and a half years of fourteen billion dollars, and had had to contribute one billion four hundred millions a year to pay for an army of occupation, besides the ordinary taxes; had had to secure from the outside over one billion dollars worth of food a year, and was absolutely incapacitated to manufacture, to import, or to export, our country would be in the same condition as is Belgium, if all the people in the United States had only

a little more than one half of Texas in which to raise food.

The American Commission, acting as agent for the money subscribed to support the Belgian people, reports that tuberculosis has increased in Belgium five hundred per cent on account of insufficient food. Of the seventy-five million dollars a year that the Commission has at its disposal, sixty millions is the sum advanced by the English Government. The voluntary offerings of the people of the United States are very small compared to the needs of the Belgian people. It seems to me that the Congress of the United States should meet this appalling and heart-breaking situation by voting an annual sum that would prevent the partial destruction of the Belgian people.

Maurice Maeterlinck gives this picture of Belgium to-day: —

A Cry of Distress

But little is known of what is going on in Belgium and in the invaded departments [of France]. From time to time a scandal more notorious than others is declared — an assassination of heroic patriots, monstrous drives of slaves in the North, the disquieting deportation of young Belgians able to bear arms, the robbery of six hundred millions of francs from the National Bank, and so many other such things that they cannot be recounted, for the mind quickly wearies of misfortune and horror.

A recent article in the "Daily News," which I should have thought exaggerated and incredible had it not been confirmed by private and sure information which I have received of the fearful condition of my unhappy country to-day, described without prejudice, with the impartiality and the moderation of a conscientious witness, the situation of Belgium, which is daily growing more agonizing and more abominable.

It is well known that the admirable American intervention has literally saved from death by hunger more than half of the Belgian population. Indeed, all industry is dead, the factories are closed and the machinery of the greater part of them has been taken down and sent away to Germany. These unfortunates, then, have nothing to live on but the distributions of bread and soup which, thanks to the magnificent generosity of Americans and to the devotion of all, are admirably organized in all the centers of population.

The correspondent of the "Daily News," who has seen it with his own eyes, describes to us the sad and solemn spectacle of these crowds which every day, for so many, many days, patiently stand and wait for the meager dole of food which prolongs life without delivering from death. These crowds do not consist of the poor. Among them are no rags and none of the *abandon* of poverty. Those who stand there have never held out the hand to receive an alms. They are neatly dressed, resigned, silent and dignified. But all, from the oldest to the youngest, and especially the youngest, show the sunken and unmistakable faces, the wan and characteristic faces, of those who *for nearly two years have not eaten enough food to satisfy their hunger!*

Tuberculosis, too, is beginning to work its frightful ravages on these emaciated throngs. As always is the case, it attacks preferably the young men, the women, and the children, cutting off in their flower the vital powers of the nation. At Brussels alone hundreds of new cases are reported every day; and in certain centers where the laboring population is more dense, notably at Ghent, at Liège, at Alost, the plague is spreading with alarming rapidity and virulence. It involves the salvation and the future of a race.

What can be done, and what remedy can be found?

Shall we redouble our aid? Certainly, if it is possible. Shall we call once more on the outraged conscience and humanity of neutrals? Perhaps: we do not easily lose the habit of hoping against all hope. But, in any case, we must at present write down this crime, more perfidious than all others of the long and somber list of crimes which we will hold in remembrance on the coming day of settlement of accounts.

The spirit of Belgium is eloquently expressed by Baron Beyens: —

If Europe turns aside from the sight of this indomitable resistance, and looks at our country, what does she see there? The head of the Belgian clergy, the very incarnation of civic patriotism and priestly virtues, stimulating his flock to courage and endurance, caring nought for coercion or threats, and awaiting with full trust in the Divine Judge the day when in his church (not spared, alas! by the invader) he shall celebrate the *Te Deum* of our deliverance. Everywhere she sees devotion to the Fatherland and to Christian solidarity: she sees the Burgomaster of Brussels, whose brave voice could only be silenced by imprisonment, although even now his memory and his example still hover, as an ever-present encouragement, above his fellow-citizens and his city; she sees men who yesterday were rich, heads of banks that to-day are closed and of workshops that to-day are empty, joining with the intellectual flower of Brussels citizens to provide for the poor, to insure that the people shall not die of hunger and privation; she sees women of all sorts and conditions turned into Sisters of Charity; she sees fathers and mothers, stricken to the heart by the death of their sons or anxious as to their fate, living often in homes that the enemy has rifled, yet with calm, tearless eyes and faces ennobled by sacrifice; and last of all she sees, behind the classes that once were privileged, the admirable crowd, the army of humble toilers, stoically enduring their forced loss of work or their inability to help their country, watching in grim silence the countless dead and wounded brought in from the enemy regiments, who do not cease to dye with their blood that Belgian soil where they thought they had only to appear in order to conquer!

No, such a people cannot die. The Belgian soul, whose existence some dared to deny, has gained a new temper from the flame of battle, and it still lives to-day, more vigorous than ever, to realize our national motto — "Union makes Strength." But Belgium is not yet at the end of her long ordeal, at the limit of her travail, or on the eve of drying her

tears. The iron monster of German militarism cannot be battered down in a day. I have seen him at too close quarters preparing and arming for the fray to have any delusions on that score. The league of his adversaries has swollen in number and grown in power; but at present this only whets his rage, and thus for the time being his might, like that of a man who suddenly goes mad, is redoubled. Germany is not yet near to waking up, with a start, from her tragic dream of triumph and domination. The day of liberation is slow to dawn for us, and we still have a long agony to go through. But let no Belgian, whether he has been forced to take the road of exile, or is suffering, with no word of complaint, the well-nigh intolerable contact with the oppressor — let no Belgian become for a single instant a prey to discouragement or despair! The hour will strike without fail from the belfries of our town halls and the steeples of our churches — the hour when our country, reconquered and ten times more dear, will press to her lacerated bosom all her sons, once more united in an equal love for their common mother; the hour when Belgium will recover her place among the nations, a loftier place than ever, owing to her valor in the combat and her steadfastness in adversity.

I can close this chapter fittingly by quoting from the last writings of Émile Verhaeren, which he gave to an American to have published in America. Catherine D. Groth, whose privilege it was to bring these writings to America, published this little essay in the New York "Evening Post Magazine" of January 20, 1917. In a brief introduction she says: —

Few felt the war as keenly as Verhaeren. Not only was he Belgian to the core, but he had always been an ardent pacifist. All his efforts had tended toward increasing human happiness, and war had always seemed to him an unpardonable blot. He had the keenest sympathy for Germany, where he was much appreciated. His best biography, in fact, was written by an Austrian.

When the war came, Verhaeren suffered, not merely as a Belgian in seeing his country ruined, its precious art destroyed, its monuments wrecked, — every stone of which he knew and loved, — but as a human being he was hurt in his inmost spirit. It was as if Germany's dastardly action had knocked the very ground away from under his feet. His faith in humanity began to shake. I shall never forget how one day, about a year after the outbreak of the war, when sitting on a balcony overlooking Paris, and talking about Belgium's heroism in the early days of the German invasion, he dwelt again and again on the idea: —

"And we had always looked upon them as our friends!"

For the first time in his life, through the war, this great man, whose gospel had always been greater and greater breadth of heart, learned the meaning of hate.

Proud Belgium

By Émile Verhaeren

No matter how desperate their plight may seem, Belgians have no right to lament or to dwell on their misery. They owe it to themselves to be worthy of their soldiers, who were all heroes.

That women driven from their villages with a flock of children hanging at their skirts weep as they walk the highroads of hunger, exile, and suffering — that is natural. But men, and especially those who are capable of thought or action, must not echo the cries of sorrow.

They who before the war dreamt of a Greater Belgium did not wish for more territory in Europe, or for greater colonial expansion in Africa. They longed only for a Belgian renascence, economical and intellectual. Their goal was a more active and perfected industrial life; a mode of thinking more audacious and alive. They sought influence, not conquest.

Yet in all its history Belgium's influence has never been as great as to-day. True, our factories have been silenced, and seem to have lost their pulsating life and their ardent breath. But they are not dead. As soon as the war is over they will

awaken like extraordinary monsters. No matter how heavy the cover of ashes, their thousands of tentacles will shake it off with ease, as they begin to stretch and move in the reborn day.

We will be younger and more ready than ever before. Until to-day, danger had never visited our nation. We lived from day to day, with no thought of the morrow. We were busied with our own petty quarrels, intent on being lawyers, shopkeepers, or postmasters, instead of citizens. We were like the rich who do not know poverty. War, we felt, was the affair of other nations.

And then it came upon us, ferocious and overwhelming, when we least expected it. Like a mountain whose sides should suddenly crack and topple, William's Empire fell upon us. We were all alone and few in number. We were treacherously attacked. We rallied hastily in Liège, in our old forts. We had to improvise our courage, invent our defense, and awaken a new soul within us. And we did it all in one day, one hour, one instant. We astounded the world.

Oh, how wonderful they were, those moments of sublime recklessness and glory! Some there were who at the sight of our little army marching to the front could not help a murmur: —

"Cannon food — nothing but cannon food. We have no army, no generals, no forts."

Four days later a name, unknown even the night before, was on all lips. The urchins disguised themselves as General Leman; young girls sold his picture in the streets. And the same little soldiers that we had pitied as cannon food came back to Brussels from the battlefield, their arms full of Prussian helmets. They were timid and elated at the same time, unable to realize the admirable part they had been playing. Women kissed them, and we carried them in triumph. Exalted moments of fever and pride! The weather was radiant. The air seemed golden. One inhaled the sun as well as heroism.

Our first successes at Liège, followed by those at Haelen, Aerschot, Alost, Dixmude, and Furnes, have for all eternity imposed Belgium on the respect, regard, and admiration of

the world. For nearly three weeks we held back the enormous German forces. They had counted on disposing of us in three days. We knocked the most convincing holes in their doctrine of invincibility. Like moving blocks, elbow to elbow, cemented one to the other, they marched on our forts. Before the assault they cried: "Kaiser! Kaiser!" And the Belgian *mitrailleuses* replied with a dry, crackling noise. One after another they fell, in rows, as a pack of cards. The light from a wandering Zeppelin played over their agonizing faces. A long wail arose and grew weaker. Soon all was silence and death.

That our desperate resistance enabled France and England to mass their forces and organize their campaign of salvation, that is not for us to repeat or insist on.

If we only bear in mind the immense service which we rendered the Occident and humanity, our hearts can be filled with nothing but pride. Tears or lamentations would be a dishonor. Let us say to ourselves that, of all nations, Belgium was chosen to fulfill one of the greatest destinies; she had the honor of forming the first and most decisive barrier of the rampart which modern civilization erected against ferocity and military barbarism, and her story will be inscribed with those of the few immortal peoples.

That is why many feel that Belgium dates from yesterday only. Never has she been as real, as powerful, as now, when, deprived of all territory, she has for emblem and standard only the banner of her King.

The people of Belgium have one infinite compensation. They are the victims, not the aggressor.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SUBMARINE IN ITS RELATION TO RAIL POWER *versus* SEA POWER

The submarine differs from other warships in a most important respect. It introduces the factor of almost permanent invisibility. It cannot be destroyed by other submarines, and it can usually elude all kinds of warships. In this particular war the Central Powers being blockaded and their mercantile marine excluded from the sea, their principal naval aim is to destroy as much as possible of the mercantile marine afloat. For this is a war between rail power and sea power. War, like industry, depends for its very existence upon transportation. Germany and her allies can reach all battle-fronts by rail. Thus far Germany and her allies have produced all supplies for the civil population and for their armies from their own territory or territory occupied by their armies. Germany believes that the Central Powers constitute a self-supporting world in this war, and are independent of the sea.

The belief of the German naval experts is that the submarine could, if used "ruthlessly," destroy so much of the world's shipping as to starve out England and deprive France of her imports of coal and steel. Without these imports France's munition factories would soon be closed.

In fact the German authorities and the German people look to the submarine as the surest weapon to secure success.

I found no one in Germany who did not most heartily and completely approve the sinking of the Lusitania, and should Germany repeat the act, all Germany would approve. There was a mingled feeling of contempt and dislike for the victims. They were looked upon as wealthy and impudent Americans, who, in spite of being warned by the Imperial Government, sailed on a ship that Germans regarded as a warship.

I had great difficulty in understanding the German submarine rules and practice, and finally I was given a document prepared under the authority of the Government, which I reproduce herewith: —

(1) In using her submarine weapon, Germany distinguishes between hostile and neutral ships.

Enemy men-of-war are torpedoed without warning. *Armed enemy merchantmen* are considered as warships: this is done for the reason that their commanders have received the orders published in the German memorandum of February 8, 1916, concerning the treatment of armed enemy merchantmen, to open fire on every German submarine at sight even before any hostile act has been committed; this renders a warning from the submarine impossible. Enemy merchantmen are also sunk without warning in the war zone, i.e., the waters around the British Isles mentioned in the proclamation of February 4, 1915. An exception is made, however, for enemy passenger steamers (liners) which for reasons of humanity are not sunk, even in the war zone, without warning and only after saving the lives of passengers and crew.

(2) As for *neutral ships* Germany respects both the rights of neutrals and the principles of humanity, i.e., neutral merchantmen are sunk only if they carry contraband and cannot be brought into port by a prize crew. No neutral ship is sunk without previously establishing her identity and cargo, and only after saving the lives of passengers and crew. This also applies to neutral ships in the war zone.

(3) Germany takes into consideration the principles of humanity inasmuch as she never sinks enemy passenger steamers (liners) without warning and only after saving the lives of passengers and crew. As a part of the enemy passenger steamers are armed, and as the English Admiralty orders which were found on British ships and published in the German memorandum of February 8, 1916, give every reason to expect that they will use their armament for offensive purposes, it is possible that a naval fight may take place between such an armed passenger boat and the German naval forces. For this reason it is advisable for neutral passengers to avoid traveling on armed enemy passenger boats.

(4) In order to maintain the international passenger traffic of neutrals the German Government several months ago suggested to enter into negotiations with the neutral Governments and to designate as absolutely safe certain specially marked neutral steamers which would follow certain routes previously agreed upon (*vide* note handed to American Ambassador on July 8, 1915).

Berlin, April 15, 1916.

This is a sufficiently formidable document, as it was interpreted by the submarine commanders, but the new submarine policy of Germany has thrown all law and decency to the winds. Her lawless and heartless acts in Belgium now find their counterpart on the sea.

The German naval authorities believe that England can be forced to surrender from starvation by the ruthless use of the submarine. An expert on the submarine said to me, "We can starve England into submission in five weeks if America will not interfere."

The noted naval writer, Captain Persius, commenting on the German White Book recently issued, containing the correspondence between Germany and the United States on the submarine controversy says: —

The Government of the United States had it in their power to destroy all differences of opinion at their source, and do away with all the difficulties of submarine war. If only they had undertaken to guarantee that no merchant ship would be armed, Germany would then, on her part, have undertaken that no merchant ship should be attacked without warning.

On February 8, 1915, the German Government transmitted a memorandum to this effect to the United States and to all other neutral countries. Her point of view is unassailable. Unfortunately, the Government of the United States did not reply to this message. We hope we shall not again have to pass through such a correspondence.

We have constantly emphasized the declaration of the German Government, that war between Germany and the United States would be inexcusable. This ought to receive the consent of the German people. We have expressed our confidence that our Government would find a way out of the labyrinth of international law which is compatible with a peace policy.

In a recent contribution to the "Berliner Tageblatt," Captain Persius says: —

Almost the whole production of the world outside Europe is at the service of our enemies, but does them no good if, as a result of the shortage of freight space, they can make no use of it. . . . The main causes of the shortage of freight space are the sinking of numerous merchant ships, the confiscation by the Government for military purposes of a great part of the mercantile marine, the reduced construction of new merchant ships, losses due to the war, capture for carrying contraband, running upon mines, and so on.

Captain Persius ends his article as follows: —

We look to the future full of confidence in the efficiency of our submarine arm, which, one may with certainty expect, will constantly increase in strength. We hope that the shortage of tonnage already prevailing among our enemies can be

brought up to the point at which it will be intolerable, and this will surely be of considerable importance for the military situation.

The "Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung" says: —

We come to the conclusion that the continuation of cruiser warfare with submarines to the present extent will bring Great Britain to the verge of ruin within a year. Our submarines can conquer England.

In a sense, every ship that floats is in the German mind an asset of her enemies. If she could largely destroy the shipping of the world, England and France must yield and accept peace on German terms.

The handicap under which France labors is set forth clearly by Henri Bérenger, of the French Senate, in the chapter, "Why Did Germany Invade Belgium?"

Even if France could supply herself with everything excepting coal and iron, she must become quickly helpless if imports are cut off.

The task of the British naval and mercantile marine is stupendous. Germany does not fear Great Britain's navy. It cannot reach her or any of her allies. Sea power in this war means merchant ships. Germany can win the war only in one of two ways: either by securing a separate peace with Russia, thereby enormously increasing her rail power, or by destroying so many ships that England cannot import food, raw materials, and munitions, for herself and allies, and, further, by the same course rendering it impossible for England to support her forces at Salonika and Egypt. Germany can interfere with the communications of the Allies. The Allies cannot interfere with Germany's communications.

Further views are given by Dr. Flamm, Professor

of Ship Construction at the Technical High School at Charlottenburg, who publishes in the "Vossische Zeitung" an extraordinary article on the impending destruction of the British Empire by German submarines. He begins by explaining how England has been protected for centuries by her insularity. He writes: —

This country, whose dishonorable Government produced this terrible world-war by the most contemptible means, and solely in selfish greed of gain, has always been able to enjoy the fruits of its unscrupulousness because it was reckoned as unassailable. But everything is subject to change, and that applies to-day to the security of England's position. Thank God, the time has now come when precisely its complete encirclement by the seas has become the greatest danger for the existence of the British nation.

The writer explains that England cannot be self-supporting. He proceeds: —

Technical progress, in the shape of submarines, has put into the hands of all England's enemies the means at last to sever the vital nerve of the much-hated enemy, and to pull him down from his position of ruler of the world, which he has occupied for centuries with ever-increasing ruthlessness and selfishness. This exalted and noble aim has to-day come within reach, and it is German intellect and German work that have paved the way.

England must reckon with the fact that her world-supremacy cannot much longer exist, and that the strongest navy can make no difference. When once the invisible necktie is round John Bull's neck, his breathing will soon cease, and the task of successfully putting this necktie on him is solely the question of technical progress and of time, which now moves so fast. . . .

Thus before very long a world fate should befall England.

Rail Power *versus* Sea Power

The American Civil War may be regarded as the first great war in which railroads played a vital part. The Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) was the first great war that was distinctly a war of rail power *versus* sea power. Soon after the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War, I had a talk with General Kuropatkin, as to the reasons for Russia's failure. He said that if the Siberian Railway had been a double-track in place of a single-track road, the issue of the war would have been different. If the capacity of the road had been only twenty per cent greater, Russia would have won; and in an article in "McClure's Magazine," General Kuropatkin wrote: —

> If these lines had been more efficient, we would have brought up our troops more rapidly, and, as things turned out, 150,000 men concentrated at first would have been of far more value to us than the 300,000 who were gradually assembled during nine months, only to be sacrificed in detail. . . . If we had had a better railway and had been able to mass at Liao-yang the number specified, we should undoubtedly have won the day in spite of our mistakes.

Edwin A. Pratt writes in "The Rise of Rail Power":

> Kuropatkin himself certainly did all he could to improve the transport conditions. In a statement he submitted to the Tsar on March 7, 1904, he declared that of all urgently pressing questions that of bettering the railway communication between Russia and Siberia was the most important; and he added: "It must, therefore, be taken up at once, in spite of the enormous cost. The money expended will not be wasted; it will, on the contrary, be in the highest sense productive inasmuch as it will shorten the duration of the war."

What the railways did was to enable the Russians to col-

lect at the theater of war, by the time the war itself came to an end, an army of one million men, — of whom two thirds had not yet been under fire, — together with machine guns, howitzers, shells, small-arm ammunition, field railways, wireless telegraphy, supplies, and technical stores of all kinds. Kuropatkin says of this achievement: —

> The War Department had, with the coöperation of other departments, successfully accomplished a most colossal task. What single authority would have admitted, a few years ago, the possibility of concentrating an army of a million men fifty-four hundred miles away from its base of supply and equipment by means of a poorly constructed single-line railway?

Russia, in fact, agreed to make peace at a time when the prospect of her being able to secure a victory was greater than it had been at any time during the earlier phases of the war; but the Japanese failed to attain all they had hoped for, the primary causes of such failure, in spite of their repeated victories, being, as told in the British "Official History" of the war, that "Port Arthur held out longer than had been expected, and the Trans-Siberian Railway enabled Russia to place more men in the field than had been thought possible."

Thus, in respect to rail power, at least, Russia still achieved a remarkable feat in her transport of an army so great a distance by a single-track line of railway. Such an achievement was unexampled, while, although Fate was against the ultimate success of her efforts, Russia provided the world with a fresh object lesson as to what might have been done, in a campaign waged more than five thousand miles from the base of supplies, if only the line of rail communication had been equal from the first to the demands it was called upon to meet.

In the war between Russia and Japan, the long distance (fifty-four hundred miles) over a single-track road, compared to the short sea passage for Japan, gave the first campaign in favor of Japan. This was

absolutely a war in which transportation was by rail as against sea. It is not precisely parallel to this war, because Russia was not blockaded, and further, because the resources of Russia were much greater than those of Japan; while in the present war, up to this time, the power of the respective belligerents has been more nearly equal.

I was constantly told in Germany that the natural resources and manufacturing and agricultural resources and abilities, controlled by Germany and her allies, could enable Germany to wage war for years. I was told that the two million Russian prisoners were a most vital factor in her agriculture. Given sufficient natural resources, it becomes merely a question of man power. For this reason, we see the Belgians being impressed in hundreds of thousands, the Poles being drawn upon. Even the Servians are being taken by the Austrians, while by a new law all males in Germany from the age of sixteen to sixty are conscripted to serve the nation in accordance with the war needs as determined by the Government. Also, of course, women and girls, as in all the warring countries, offer their services in millions.

Herr Deutsch, Chairman of the A.E.G. (the General Electric Company of Germany), assured me that the blockade was greatly to Germany's advantage. It had greatly stimulated invention, and had made Germany and her allies independent of imports.

Germany and her allies, then, believe that they are largely independent of sea-borne commerce, and having the advantage of interior lines of communication, they are also free from the risks of communication by sea. On the other hand, her enemies are vitally dependent

on the sea. Sea power in this war is more important than it has ever before been in any great war. The railroad has been developed as an instrument of transportation to a degree undreamed of in previous wars. The Allies cannot interfere with Germany's rail communication. Germany believes she can destroy or at least fatally cripple the sea communication of her enemies.

THE SUBMARINING OF PASSENGER SHIPS

No single event in modern history has had so much influence on public opinion as the sinking of the Lusitania. The ship was famous for her size and her speed, and was a masterpiece of the science of shipbuilding. The invasion of Belgium and rumors of atrocities had caused hostile feelings against Germany. But no enemy of Germany imagined that she would sink the Lusitania with its complement of over two thousand souls, including scores of children, nearly two hundred Americans, Greeks, Dutch, Swiss, Mexicans, Russians, French, Italians, and British.

I remember when an advertisement appeared, purporting to be from the Imperial German Government warning passengers against sailing on such ships, I thought it must be some enemy of Germany who, to injure Germany, caused the insertion of such an advertisement.

The effect on public opinion was such that no atrocities charged against the German naval and military forces seemed incredible. In a little pamphlet published in England there is a description of the acts of Alfred Vanderbilt and his valet which is worth reprinting many times: —

There were many heroes that day on board the Lusitania; among them stands out the figure of Alfred Vanderbilt, the American millionaire, whom Englishmen, Frenchmen, and others had learned to love as a sportsman who always thought and acted straight. When the ship was sinking, his valet, Ronald Denyer, was by his side. A few days later a Canadian lady, Mrs. Lines, told the story of how these two men — master and valet — acted when they realized that either they must play the coward's part or sink in the great ship.

"People will not talk of Mr. Vanderbilt in future as the millionaire sportsman and man of pleasure," this Canadian lady declared; "he will be remembered as 'the children's hero.' Men and women will salute his name. When death was nearing him, he showed a gallantry which no words of mine can adequately describe. He stood outside the palm saloon, on the starboard side, with Ronald Denyer by his side. He looked round on the scene of horror and despair with pitying eyes. 'Find all the kiddies you can, boy,' he said to his valet. The man rushed off immediately to collect the children, and as he brought them to Mr. Vanderbilt, the millionaire dashed to the boats with two little ones in his arms at a time. When he could no longer find any more children, he went to the assistance of the women and placed as many as he could in safety. In all his work he was gallantly assisted by Ronald Denyer, and the two continued their efforts to the very end."

Mr. Vanderbilt was a conspicuous passenger, and hence his record has been preserved. He was not the only hero who gave up hope of life in order that women and children might be saved. As the huge ship went under and the water became black with men and women struggling for life and with little children, full of terror but hardly realizing the terrible fate before them, many men, British, American, or otherwise, courted death in the very effort to rescue others. The destruction of the Lusitania was a crime without parallel in human history, but it has left behind memories which may well be a glorious heritage to those who, in beating along life's highway, have not abandoned those heroic, though

simple, traits of character which distinguish men from beasts.

Within twenty minutes after the two torpedoes struck the great vessel most of the men, women, and children were struggling in the water. Eleven hundred and ninety-eight were drowned.

While the whole world was stunned with amazement and horror, the German people and press, largely misled as to the cargo and arming of the vessel, regarded the sinking of the Lusitania as a glorious victory.

The sinking of the Lusitania is a success for our submarines which must be placed beside the greatest achievements in the naval war. . . . The sinking of the great British steamer is a success the moral significance of which is still greater than the material success. With joyful pride we contemplate this latest deed of our navy, and it will not be the last.[1]

The news will be received by the German people with unanimous satisfaction, since it proves to England and the whole world that Germany is quite in earnest in regard to her submarine warfare.[2]

We rejoice over this new success of the German navy.[3]

On March 28, 1915, more than six weeks before the sinking of the Lusitania, the Falaba, a passenger ship bound from Liverpool to an African port, had been sunk without warning.

The sinking of the steamer Arabic on August 19, 1915, is thus described by one of the passengers: —

I was in my cabin, and was in pyjamas when I heard the cry that a steamer was being torpedoed. Whether it was the Arabic or another ship attacked by a German foe I did not

[1] *Kölnische Zeitung*, May 10, 1915.
[2] *Ibid.*, May 15, 1915.
[3] *Neue Freie Presse*, May 15, 1915.

know. But I hastened to dress myself and rushed on deck to see the British steamship Dunsley in trouble. After the torpedo had penetrated her hull, a loud explosion followed. I naturally thought that the next steamer the German submarine would attack would be the White Star liner I was on, and my premonition proved only too true.

The tramp liner succumbed to the torpedo and had disappeared with a plunge in the ocean. Within a very short time the lifeboats were quickly launched, as were also the life-saving rafts, and were floating in the water. The Arabic was then struck, without any warning whatever being given. She was hit on the port side with a torpedo, and a similar explosion to that on the Dunsley followed. It was a deafening sound and thrilling in the extreme, and made all the passengers considerably alarmed. But there was no time to think of the seriousness of the situation. Life was at stake, and no one knew what to do to save it.

Excitement reigned. There was a bit of a swell on that made it difficult to get into the boats as they were bobbing up and down. However, I got into one, where I had an opportunity of seeing the Arabic take her final dip in the ocean. She caused a great suction, and the water turned it into whirlpools, which drew the various lifeboats and rafts into it and twisted them round and round, and made one think they were finally going to be submerged and sent to the bottom.

I saw several women, men, and children in the water struggling for their lives. Our boat proceeded towards two men in the water who had life-saving apparatus on. We rescued them by dragging them into the boat.

Here again the tragedy is illuminated by deeds of noble heroism. The third engineer, a man named London, stood by his engines, to carry out the orders from the bridge that would help in rescuing the passengers. He went down with the ship. This man and others remained unflinchingly at their posts, and gave up their lives that others might live.

New horrors were added to the sinking of the Ancona, an Italian passenger ship, which was sunk in the Mediterranean November 7, 1915.

In this instance the submarine carried more powerful guns than other submarines which had been active, and when yet afar off brought the ship under a heavy bombardment, killing and injuring passengers. Then, without pause, although the Ancona stopped, a torpedo was fired hitting the ship in a vulnerable spot. Amid the piteous screaming of women and the heartrending panic of the children, the captain and his officers endeavored to transfer their human freight to the boats. While this work of mercy was still in progress, the submarine continued the deadly onslaught from her guns, pouring shot after shot on the ship and on the boats with callous indifference. The only explanation from Vienna of this tragedy, which closed in death the eyes of over two hundred men, women, and children, was that the "Ancona had tried to escape." This was the excuse made in an Austrian official *communiqué*. The real facts, ascertained after the fullest inquiry, were set forth by the Italian Government: —

The Austrian *communiqué* is false in its fundamental facts. All the survivors of the Ancona testify that the submarine made no signal whatsoever to bring the ship to a stop, nor did it even fire a blank warning shot. This armed aggression took place without any preliminary warning.

The Ancona was bound for New York, and could not have been carrying either such passengers or cargo as could justify capture, and, therefore, she had no reason for attempting to avoid examination. Moreover, it is a false and malicious assertion to state that the loss of so many human lives was due to the conduct of the crew. On the contrary,

the bombardment by the submarine continued after the Ancona had stopped, and was also directed against the boats filled with people, thereby causing numerous victims.

One of the third-class passengers of the Ancona who escaped by a miracle has described the scenes of suffering and agony which the crew of the submarine witnessed without one pang of regret: —

Exactly at one o'clock on Monday afternoon, we sighted a submarine at a great distance. She came up to the surface and made full speed in our direction, firing as she did so a shot which went wide across our bows. We took this to be a warning to stop; immediately there was the wildest panic on board, not only among the women and children, but among the men too. The former screamed piteously, and the frightened children clung desperately to their mothers.

Meantime, the submarine continued to shell us, while gaining rapidly upon us. After the fifth shot the chart-house was partly carried away, and another shot completely destroyed it. The engines then ceased going and the Ancona was at a standstill. The submarine, which we could now see dimly, was Austrian. She came alongside, and then we heard the commander talking to the captain of the Ancona. In a somewhat curt manner we were told that the Austrian commander had given a few minutes' time for the passengers and crew to abandon the ship. Then the submarine withdrew to a little distance.

No time was lost in making the necessary arrangements, but soon there ensued a regular pandemonium. All the passengers, women and men, big and little, appeared to have completely lost their heads. The submarine continued to fire around the vessel. There was a rush for the boats, which were being lowered. The passengers got into the boats, but in the confusion many of them were not altogether free from the davits and were overturned by their heavy load, the occupants being thrown into the water.

Many struggled before our eyes until they were drowned. The shrieks of the women and children rent the air, but no

help, it appeared, could be given. . . . During this indescribable and heartrending scene the submarine continued to discharge shot after shot. Such ruthless conduct was all the more incomprehensible as not one shot was directed at the ship itself, the assailants firing all round the vessel as if to create as much terror as possible.

The next great tragedy was the sinking of the Persia, bound from London to Bombay. The ship sunk in five minutes. There were five hundred and fifty people on board, including twenty Americans. Three hundred and eighty-five perished.

Submarine Warfare on Merchantmen and the Execution of Captain Fryatt of the Brussels

The death of no single individual so hardened the British determination as the execution of Captain Fryatt. On the 18th of February, 1915, the German Government announced its submarine policy as follows: —

Germany's war zone and neutral flags

Berlin, February 4 (by wireless to Sayville, L.I.) — The German Admiralty to-day issued the following communication: —

The waters around Great Britain and Ireland, including the whole English Channel, are declared a war zone on and after February 18, 1915.

Every enemy merchant ship found in this war zone will be destroyed, even if it is impossible to avert dangers which threaten the crew and passengers.

Also neutral ships in the war zone are in danger, as in consequence of the misuse of neutral flags ordered by the British Government on January 31, and in view of the hazards of naval warfare, it cannot always be avoided that attacks meant for enemy ships endanger neutral ships.

Shipping northward, around the Shetland Islands, in the

eastern basin of the North Sea, and a strip of at least thirty nautical miles in breadth along the Dutch coast, is endangered in the same way.

On the 20th of March, 1915, Captain Fryatt, who had successfully dodged submarines for many voyages between Harwich and Holland, noticed a submarine in his path. He immediately tried to ram the submarine. That was his crime.

The statement of the German Government in defense of its execution of Captain Fryatt is as follows: —

The accused was condemned to death because, although he was not a member of a combatant force, he made an attempt on the afternoon of March 20, 1915, to ram the German submarine U-33 near the Maas Lightship. The accused, as well as the first officer and the chief engineer of the steamer, received at the time from the British Admiralty a gold watch as a reward of his brave conduct on that occasion, and his action was mentioned with praise in the House of Commons.

August 10, 1916, a further statement was issued by the German Government: —

The German War Tribunal sentenced him to death because he had performed an act of war against the German sea forces, although he did not belong to the armed forces of his country. He was not deliberately shot in cold blood without due consideration, as the British Government asserts, but he was shot as a *franc-tireur*, after calm consideration and thorough investigation. As martial law on land protects the soldiery against assassination, by threatening the offender with the penalty of death, so it protects the members of the sea forces against assassination at sea. Germany will continue to use this law of warfare in order to save her submarine crews from becoming the victims of *francs-tireurs* at sea.

At the end of a careful analysis of law and precedents, James Brown Scott, in the "American Journal of International Law," quotes from the German Prize Code as in force July 1, 1915, which says: —

If an armed enemy merchant vessel offers armed resistance against measures taken under the law of prize, such resistance is to be overcome with all means available. The enemy Government bears all responsibility for any damages to the vessel, cargo, and passengers. The crew are to be taken as prisoners of war. The passengers are to be left to go free, unless it appears that they participated in the resistance. In the latter case they may be proceeded against under extraordinary martial law.

Mr. Scott concludes, after quoting numerous authorities from many countries, as follows: —

If the views above expressed are correct, that there is nothing in the law nor in the practice of nations which prevents a belligerent merchant vessel from defending itself from attack and capture, the execution of Captain Fryatt appears to have been without warrant in international law and illegal, whatever it may have been according to the municipal ordinances of Germany.

The execution of Captain Fryatt was strictly in accordance with the principles of German maritime laws. It was absolutely against the maritime laws of all other nations. The question arises, Why does Germany pursue a policy that insures a world hostility that may last for years, and amounts almost to a moral boycott?

First, because she regards the English blockade as illegal and directed toward the starvation of civilians.

Secondly, because, feeling justified in her use of the submarine, she believes that she can thereby carry out her political aims.

With submarines that can shell merchantmen at a distance of six or seven miles, the submarine becomes in actuality a cruiser, and a cruiser with the added advantage of invisibility in getting to its field of operation.

German Submarine Laws

The German submarine policy has caused nearly all the trouble that has arisen between the United States and Germany. Also the sinking of the Lusitania and similar events have aroused the horror of millions and hundreds of millions of neutrals, and have solidified the feelings of the belligerent countries. One must have known England to realize what a miracle the establishment of universal conscription was. Certainly Germany's submarine policy is accountable in a great degree for the arousing of the English people.

In the chapter on "Asiatic Turkey," I have explained how Germany, by securing this region, would dominate the Suez Canal, North Africa, the Persian Gulf, India, Persia, etc. *It is the absolute conviction of the naval and military authorities of Germany that by the full use of the submarine, she could get all that is implied in her Asia Minor plans.* This can be achieved both by starving out England as to food, France as to coal and iron, and by hampering the supplies of men and munitions to Salonika, Egypt, and Mesopotamia.

It must not be supposed that the sinking of the Lusitania was planned hastily and repented of afterwards. Germany will never admit that she did wrong in sinking the Lusitania. In spite of the universal world-horror, the identical policy was continued. Why? Because to Germany the submarine is the instrument

whereby she can secure her aims. For the purpose of submarine warfare, the German Government has made new laws governing the status of merchantmen as to their right to resist capture. Under these new laws Captain Fryatt was executed.

The new German laws are upheld by Dr. Georg Schramm, Adviser to the German Admiralty, and Professor Heinrich Triepel, but by no other German authorities.

Professor Oppenheim, of the University of Cambridge, maintained that almost universally it was an accepted principle that merchant ships had a right to arm and to resist capture. Professor Triepel, replying, quotes Professor Oppenheim's statement that the publicists are in favor of the right of a merchant ship to defend itself and adds: —

> He is right [that is, Professor Triepel says Professor Oppenheim is right]. The literature is upon his side. Not only in the English and the Anglo-American works on international law and especially on maritime law, but also in the French, Belgian, Italian, and Swedish science, the right of self-defense as far as I can see is generally acknowledged. Only in very isolated cases a doubt is ventured. The majority of the later German writers maintain silence on the question. In the older writers, the English doctrine is followed.[1]

The new German doctrine which justifies her principles of submarine warfare, justifies the hanging of Captain Fryatt, and denies the right of merchantmen to resist capture, is printed in the "American Journal of International Law Quarterly."[2] I quote: —

[1] Professor Triepel, in *Zeitschrift für Völkerrechts* (1914), vol. VIII, p. 391.
[2] October, 1916, pp. 871, 872.

Dr. Georg Schramm, Adviser to the German Admiralty, and Professor Heinrich Triepel are the chief, if not the only, German publicists who have denied the right of the belligerent merchant ship to arm itself against attack and to defend itself if attacked. In his work entitled "Das Prisenrecht in seiner Neuesten Gestalt,"[1] which may be translated as "Prize Law in its Newest or Latest Form," Dr. Schramm says: —

> A merchantman has no right of self-defense against the lawful exercise of the right of stoppage, search, and seizure. Self-defense is to be understood as a defense against an *unlawful* interference with lawful property. But in exercising the aforementioned rights the belligerent keeps within the sphere of his recognized rights, and therefore does not act contrary to law. The merchantman must therefore tolerate this interference of the belligerent; a defense, that is, an action for the purpose of warding him off, on the part of the merchantman, would, on the contrary, constitute an encroachment upon the sphere of rights of the belligerent. This applies in general to both neutral and hostile merchantmen. The latter have no exceptional status. They likewise have no right of self-defense. The contrary view, which has been held even in modern literature, especially English and American, and which would attribute to the crew of a hostile merchantman the status of combatants with respect to the enemy warship, is based not only on an absolute misjudgment of the modern idea of the legal regulation of warfare as an armed conflict between *nations*, but also on a denial of the legal maxim which, in land and naval war, grants only to the *organized* forces of the nations the authority to employ armed force in both attack and defense. This view is, moreover, illogical; for if hostile merchantmen, which owing to their very status as hostile ships are with few exceptions subject to capture and confiscation, were to be granted a right of resistance, then such authority

[1] Pages 308–10

would with all the more right have to be conceded to *neutral* ships, which are allowed on general principles to travel about freely even in naval war and are subject to seizure only under certain conditions (as in case of breach of blockade, the conveyance of contraband, etc.) as well as, under certain circumstances (not always) to confiscation. And nevertheless even those authors who would concede an exceptional status to hostile merchantmen recognize the fact of forcible resistance on the part of neutral merchantmen as a ground justifying the confiscation of the ship. It is worthy of remark that this doctrine that hostile merchantmen possess a right of defense as against the lawful acts of a warship of the enemy, while held only sporadically in the literature on the subject and lacking a legal basis from the standpoint of the modern law of war, has yet here and there been recognized in the prize law provisions of individual nations. For instance, Article 209 of the Italian *Codice per la marina mercantile* of October 24, 1877, contains the following provision: "Merchantmen when attacked by ships, *even by warships*, may defend themselves and capture them; they may also go to the defense of any other national or allied ships which are being attacked and join with them to capture prizes." Article 210 of the said *Codice* further states that in case a hostile ship "seen from the shore of the state" were to attempt to capture a prize, any national would be entitled to arm a ship (*di formare armamenti*), and go to the assistance of the merchantman attacked. Article 15 of the Russian Prize Regulations of March 27, 1895, is also pertinent to the subject; it declares: "This right (that is, the right to stop, search and seize merchantmen and their cargoes) is conceded to merchantmen in the following cases only: (1) in case of attack by allied or suspected vessels, and (2) when it is necessary to go to the assistance of Russian or neutral vessels attacked by the enemy." A similar process of reasoning prompted the provision of Article 10, paragraph 2 of the Naval War Code which recognizes the claim to the treatment as

> prisoners of war on the part of the crew of hostile merchantmen who are captured while engaged in self-defense or who have resisted attack in order to protect the ship entrusted to them. In so far as these provisions are not directed to the warding off of piratical attacks of merchantmen, they are without any legal foundation.

It is unlikely that the world at large will adopt the German submarine laws.

Did Germany intend to use the submarine as a commerce destroyer before the war broke out?

There was a discussion of the submarine in the London "Times" early in July, 1914. The "Times" for July 16, more than two weeks before the war broke out, contains a letter from Sir Percy Scott, from which I quote: —

Sir: — In the letter which you published from me on July 10, I replied to most of the criticisms of my views which had recently appeared. Yesterday Lord Sydenham raised a further question in your columns which seems to call for an answer. With the greater part of his letter it is unnecessary for me to deal. Lord Sydenham is not a seaman, but a soldier, and he cannot be expected to appreciate the technical points in my argument. With reference, however, to the question of the attack of our commerce by submarine, he says: —

> Capture of vessels at sea is an old right of war. The right to kill unresisting non-combatants, engaged in peaceful avocations, has never been recognized. The submarine cannot capture, it must destroy. I do not believe that the sentiment of the world in the twentieth century would tolerate for a moment proceedings which have hitherto been associated with piracy only in its blackest form. Considerations of humanity apart, there are strong reasons for believing that this relapse into savagery would not serve the purpose of the Navy

which so far degraded itself, and I doubt whether Sir Percy Scott has thought out this part of his programme.

This I consider a dangerous and most misleading doctrine, because it is calculated to make the British public believe that their food-supply will be safe in time of war. In order to make its fallacy manifest, I will quote the following extract from a letter written by a foreign naval officer: —

> If we went to war with an insular country, depending for its food on supplies from oversea, it would be our business to stop that supply. On the declaration of war we should notify the enemy that she should warn those of her merchant ships coming home not to approach the island, as we were establishing a blockade of mines and submarines. Similarly we should notify all neutrals that such a blockade had been established and that if any of their vessels approached the island they would be liable to destruction either by mines or submarines, and therefore would do so at their own risk. . . . Trade is timid. It will not need more than one or two ships sent to the bottom to hold up the food-supply of the country.
>
> I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
>
> PERCY SCOTT, &c.

In the "Political Science Quarterly" for December, 1916, Professor Munroe Smith, of Columbia University, states the legal method of using submarines: —

Our State Department has consistently refused to admit that the introduction of a new weapon automatically changes the rules of international law. Until the law is changed by general acquiescence or by express convention, the new weapon must be used in compliance with existing rules. *If it is unable to do any particular kind of military work without overriding these rules, it should not attempt such work.*

CHAPTER IX

THE ZEPPELIN RAIDS IN ENGLAND

When I was in Berlin last February I read the accounts of the Zeppelin raids in Liverpool, Birkenhead, and Manchester. The German Naval Staff issued this report February 1: —

One of our airship squadrons last night threw bombs over a wide area on the docks, harbors, and factories in and near Liverpool and Birkenhead. . . . Everywhere could be observed important results, heavy explosions, and great fires. . . . Our airship was violently bombarded at all points.

The German Embassy in Washington on the 24th of February, received the following report: —

Competent German authorities give the following details concerning the airship attack on England on the night between January 31 and February 1. Liverpool docks and quayside factories were the principal objective. The bombs had good results, as a great fire was visible when the ship turned homewards. A large number of bridges between the docks were so severely damaged that for the present they cannot be used. In addition several ships in the Mersey were severely damaged, amongst them a cruiser, anchored below Birkenhead, and a transport steamer belonging to the Leyland line. A stable with two hundred horses was destroyed by fire, and the horses, with their Canadian stablemen, are said to have perished. The Booth line and the Yeoward line suffered severely, as their docks were partly destroyed. In addition, neighboring dry-docks and engine-works were destroyed, Birkenhead dry-dock and the engine- and boiler-works completely. In all over two hundred houses were destroyed by bombs and fires. At Bootle, at the mouth of the Mersey, a powder factory was completely destroyed.

In Berlin I saw an article in the London "Times" by Lord Northcliffe describing a visit to Verdun. In one place he remarked that the German official reports of the situation at Verdun were as devoid of truth as their reports of the Zeppelin raids over Liverpool and adjacent territory.

As soon as I reached Liverpool I was eager to see for myself what had happened. I saw nothing, for nothing had happened. No Zeppelin had ever come near Liverpool, Birkenhead, or Manchester. A Swedish journalist, who had made a most thorough investigation soon after the reported raid, wrote to his paper, the Stockholm "Dagblad": —

No hostile airship has been over Liverpool or Birkenhead, or, for the matter of that, over Crewe either, a place which I visited without finding any trace of Zeppelin damage. It follows that they have not been able to cause any damage there. The authorities in Liverpool and Birkenhead — towns which, as is well known, lie on the opposite sides of the wide Mersey River — gave me all the assistance I wished. I was allowed to go wherever I wished. Among other things, one of the directors of Cammel Laird showed me over the whole of this immense shipbuilding establishment in order that I might see with my own eyes and thus verify the facts. I saw every dock and every dry-dock in Liverpool and Birkenhead and every dock-bridge. I inspected particularly the docks and stores of the Booth and Yeoward Lines. In Bootle, which forms a western extension of Liverpool, I searched for the "completely destroyed" powder factory, the destruction of which would necessarily have had terrible effects in such a populous part of the town where only insane authorities would have allowed the establishment of such a factory.

I convinced myself that no powder factory has been destroyed in Bootle in recent months (for I will here only refer to what I can answer for from my own experience); that no

dock-bridge in Liverpool or Birkenhead has been recently destroyed; that no docks were damaged; that the Booth and Yeoward lines had ships which were discharging and loading cargo in the docks of these lines where no trace of damage could be discovered; that there are no quay-side factories in Liverpool and Birkenhead, and no engine-works, as the German reports state. In Birkenhead there is not one dry-dock, but several. I visited every dry-dock in Liverpool and Birkenhead, and can bear witness that none of them showed any trace of damage, much less any trace of "complete destruction." I went through the only engine and boiler-works, or rather, the only establishment which could with any accuracy be so called in Birkenhead, and I can bear witness that there, instead of "complete destruction," intense constructive activities are in full swing. I completed my detailed investigation by making inquiries from foreigners living in Liverpool, amongst whom was the Swedish Consul, who confirmed the fact that hostile airships have never been over the town. It is to be noted, amongst other things, that the steamer Stockholm was lying that night in Liverpool, and that ships in the Mersey could not have been attacked and damaged without this being observed on the Stockholm, on which there was no one who had the least notion of a Zeppelin attack on Liverpool until it had been announced from Berlin. I received similar information with regard to Manchester.

I reached London late Friday, July 28, 1916. It was a calm, clear, starlight night. "A fine night for Zeppelins," a phrase used by a young German diplomat in Brussels on a similar night last February, immediately after the Liverpool raid, came to my mind.

But I had not heard recently of Zeppelin raids and I assumed that perhaps the nights were too short. But sure enough, next morning the papers told of a raid, and during my first two weeks in London there were other raids.

This report is copied from the "Hamburger Fremdenblatt," and deals with the raid immediately following my arrival in London: —

The alarm and consternation in London was indescribable. The entire fire brigade was stationed with its engines and rescuing apparatus in the various streets and squares. The Nelson Memorial in Trafalgar Square was hastily surrounded with mountainous stacks of sandbags, and the valuable exhibits in the British and Kensington Museums were conveyed into the vaults beneath those buildings.

Red Cross banners were hoisted on the roofs of Buckingham Palace and St. James's Palace, while gigantic flags of the respective nationalities waved from the foreign embassies and consulates.

The population was for the most part hiding in cellars and underground railway tunnels. Numerous bodies of troops hurried through the streets to their respective stations. Every railway station in London, as well as the City generally, was steeped in an inky darkness, which was only lit up now and again by the searchlight projections and the fire of the anti-aircraft guns. The damage inflicted, as ascertained up to August 3, was very serious.

On the Thames several bridges, including the Tower Bridge, sustained grave injury. They have now been temporarily closed to traffic. Numerous destructive fires were caused in the West India Docks, as well as in Huntington Street and in Woolwich, many persons being killed in the latter district.

On the morning of August 3 the streets leading to the various hospitals were rendered for a time impassable to ordinary traffic, in order to permit the hundreds of ambulances to make their way with their loads of injured people.

As may be imagined, the indignation against the Government has assumed dangerous dimensions.

I examined, personally, all the places described and nothing had happened.

Another version of these raids was given in the

"Magdeburgische Zeitung" in these words — these were the raids of August 1 and 3, and the journal gives a "neutral" as authority: —

Not even the night of horror of April 26 was so terrible as the last two attacks. A London doctor states that the Germans have established a record, both in destruction and in creating such a state of nerves that, if you tell a man that the Zeppelins have so far destroyed one thousand lives, he will reply that he is afraid the next raid will destroy two or three times as many.

Sanatoria and lunatic asylums are overfilled, and after each attack the number of lunatics increases.

Rumor puts the loss of life in the attack on August 1 at six thousand, and in the attack on August 3 at fifteen thousand.

The greatest part of the damage was done in the district between Charing Cross and Waterloo Bridge. Somerset House and the Strand and the Tower Bridge district and the Custom House also suffered. Charing Cross Station is still for the most part closed.

People used to mock at the idea of reprisals for the Baralong, but now the Baralong hangs over the householder's head like a sword of Damocles.

Here is the official report. Dealing with these raids of July 28, 29, 31, and August 1, 2, and 3, the German Government sent out the following account: —

Berlin, Saturday.

Contrary to the assertions of the British Government, the general conviction reigns in London that the attack on August 1 was the most serious which London has ever been through up to the present.

Undeniable reports regarding the airship attacks of July 28, 29, 31, and August 1, 2 and 3, confirm that very heavy damage was caused.

A hall which was under construction for a remount depot was completely destroyed. Most of the horses perished.

At the mouth of the Humber a lighthouse was destroyed.

A small cruiser with three funnels and one mast was badly damaged.

Below Grimsby two munition sheds were completely destroyed.

Ships anchored between Grimsby and Cleethorpes Harbor establishments and in the neighborhood of Cleethorpes were seriously damaged.

The damage caused in Hull amounts to millions. Several arms and munition works were destroyed, as well as other establishments of military importance.

Woolwich and the surrounding districts were seriously damaged and several munition factories were hit.

In the eastern suburb of London a cotton mill used for the manufacture of shell cases was completely destroyed. Over a thousand men and women have been put out of employment.

Several large bridges across the Thames, including the foot-bridges of the Tower Bridge, were damaged.

In the docks, several warehouses and landing piers were destroyed. Ships anchored there were partly seriously damaged.

In one dock numerous ships, including a large English steamer, which were supposed to take provisions to France to the troops, were destroyed by fire.

Many persons were wounded, some seriously, by the anti-aircraft fire.

In the Thames a torpedo-boat was hit by our bombs and sank.

In Oxted, near London, two munition factories were destroyed; the surroundings of the factories were still on fire the next day.[1]

The above report is pure imagination.

On the night of Saturday, September 3, there was a raid in which a Zeppelin fell in flames at Cuffley. I quote a description of that raid from the Leipzig "Neueste Nachrichten": —

[1] Wireless press.

A most welcome message of joy! An air raid on England with the coöperation of an unprecedented number of air cruisers! Several naval and army air squadrons have sown the land of our worst foe with bombs, causing devastation on an unheard-of scale, and spreading a horror bordering on insanity everywhere from the north-easternmost extremity of the English coast to the south-western districts of London.

London, above all, has been most generously dealt with in the way of bombs. Our unapproachable king of the air distinctly saw the immense flames rising up into the night sky as with many a mighty crash blocks of houses were torn asunder. Filled with proud satisfaction, our heroes could wend their way homeward because they knew that their bombs had done excellently well. Old England's constantly improved defenses once again proved a glorious failure.

"In London the terror at the Zeppelin attacks is indescribable." Thus only yesterday wrote a friend who had spoken with neutral witnesses of the German air raids. Once again the merciless lords of the Island Empire have been filled with this uncanny, overwhelming horror, and wherever their stricken, hunted eyes turn they behold fresh pictures of ghastly destruction.

We must see to it, however, that their fears are constantly aggravated. They must find not a moment's security anywhere. They must be made to comprehend that their insular aloofness belongs to the past, and that we are in a position to clutch by the throat the unscrupulous incendiaries of the world conflagration. Even though the whole of London had to be beaten into one gigantic heap of ruins we must hammer it into their addled brains with utter ruthlessness that the German people have the iron will to overthrow their worst foe.

This whole statement is pure imagination.

Perhaps the gem of all German reports on the Zeppelin raids is an illustrated book published by the great firm of Ullstein & Co., owners of the "Vossische Zeitung" and the "Berliner Zeitung am Mittag" and

various periodicals. This book is fully illustrated with pictures of blazing and devastated English towns, factories, harbors, and ships. Besides giving all the imaginary stories that have appeared from time to time in the newspapers, the author dramatizes his stories, and supposes himself in a Zeppelin, which has already reached the English coast, and has been appointed to operate between Yarmouth and Norwich. The Great Central Railway unites these two towns. The trains on this line travel relatively slowly, but on this night their pace was accelerated. It was "flight, flight!" But above in the air there was something moving still more rapidly. Bursting bombs hailed on the railway stations, destroying, tearing. The metals rolled up like thin wire. A searchlight is turned on the Zeppelin, a bomb extinguishes it, and batteries which had fired in the light of the searchlight were silenced forever.

The Destruction goes its way along the line, which is torn up beyond recognition. A train approaches at racing speed. With thunderous crashing, which is heard above the droning of the air-screws, the locomotive pitches into the ruins, turns over, the train burns. British troops will not be transported on that line for some time to come. The German Death swings his scythe, and prepares himself for new blows. This is war — war which you would have. The starved, ruined Germany approaches you.

Bombs struck a remount dépôt. Many hundreds of horses were killed, torn to pieces. There must be no pity for these horses. It is another blow for the British front. Do the British tacticians require horses to storm the trenches? One less trouble for our comrades on the Somme.

Another Zeppelin is approaching the coast. "Forward, yonder is England!" There is a ship below. Its three slender smokestacks are visible. On this ship fell the first iron greet-

ing. Badly injured, the stricken ship runs to the coast and is stranded. "One ship less." At the end of Spurn Head the lighthouse flames out. Crash down on it went a bomb, and the proud edifice toppled over and fell with loud tumult across the mole. "One mark less to steer by!" "And the loss is all the more keenly felt because of the difficulty of navigating the river up to Hull. The English Admiralty, of course, denies everything, as usual. Lighthouse? Nothing of the kind. That was a lame mule and a young, innocent child that the bomb fell on."

Here in Grimsby are the most dangerous enemies of our U-boats — the fishermen, mine-sweepers, and the patrol boatmen, who sniff out the submarines. Great execution was done among oil-tanks, on which incendiary bombs were dropped. We get the words of command which the commanders of the Zeppelins call out to their crews: —

"Incendiary bombs!"

"Quick fire!"

Their value is millions of pounds. "Incendiary bombs! And in eight or ten places fire — a monstrous fire, lurid in the night. The place is bright as day. Panic! There underneath they are running wildly about, seeking to save themselves, seeking shelter. Close by is the railway station. One train after another steams out of the station, and a congested mass of people storms the building seeking flight. Hundreds, thousands!"

It was their last bomb. "The air seems to rotate, a current seizes the Zeppelin, shakes the gondolas, beats on the hull. The gigantic torch of fire is our sign-post and illuminates the great gray Zeppelin, which soars ever higher and higher, unapproachable as it stands out to sea!"

Now the absolute truth is that none of the statements made by the German Government or the German newspapers is true, so far as any one can find out.

A writer in the "Nineteenth Century" discusses the reasons for such fantastic statements: —

Nor does it seem likely that the German Government had been honestly deceived by the reports of its secret agents, for what object could any agent have in concocting a false story in such a case for the government employing him? One is driven in such a case to the hypothesis of calculated mendacity, though it is difficult to understand how anyone could imagine that such mendacity paid. For a falsehood about things so easily accessible to thousands of people must inevitably be discovered and show the German Government to the whole neutral world in the character of a liar — as indeed happened in this case, when the Swedish correspondent of the Stockholm "Dagblad" went to Liverpool to find out the truth on the spot.

Since the above was written the German mythological statements about the damage done by Zeppelins to Liverpool and Manchester have been matched by the statements with regard to ravages wrought in London on the occasion of a visit of Zeppelins which never took place. One supposes that the German Government has deliberately decided that the need of administering comfort at this moment (even if illusory) to the German people is so great as to outweigh the disadvantage of again appearing in the character of a liar to millions outside Germany. Well, the German Government should know its own business best.

The German people absolutely believe these fables. Dr. Rohrbach, speaking of the Zeppelin raids, writes: —

Even before Hindenburg's appointment our enemy England was made to feel that our air attacks had become more frequent and more severe than formerly. There is no possible doubt that very severe damage has been done. It is also certain that much human life — of combatants and non-combatants — has been destroyed. We regret this deeply, and have sincere sympathy with the English families into which mourning has come and will still come — more mourning than many a man and woman in England think to-day. This killing and wounding of people of the middle classes by

exploding bombs, fires, and the collapse of walls is terrible, but it is England herself and nobody else that forces us to do it.

England is a thickly settled country. Much of the destruction has been in cities, towns, and villages. The total loss of life in the forty-four Zeppelin raids ending October 2, 1916, was four hundred and thirty-one. The loss of property was commensurate with the loss of life. Assuming that during each Zeppelin raid one hundred bombs were dropped, the total number would be forty-four hundred. It was stated recently that the one thousandth shell had fallen on the Cathedral at Rheims. In fact there are many towns in Belgium and France that have suffered more material damage than all Great Britain has from the Zeppelin raids.

Personally I made a thorough investigation, especially of the raids that occurred while I was in England. I found the English reports accurate and the German reports purely imaginative.

A Zeppelin must fly very high. It looks about as long as a cigar. How can the commander looking down at the unlighted cities see the details he reports?

Accepting the horrible stories of the destruction wrought by the Zeppelin as true, there is considerable discussion in Germany of the ethics of the mode of warfare.

Theodor Kaftan, General Superintendent of the Prussian Protestant Church, publicly expressed the hope that a hundred Zeppelins would drop bombs on England on the ground that it would be the best way of serving the cause of a world-peace. "Germania," the Berlin organ of the Center Party and of the Prus-

sian Roman Catholics, now expresses complete acquiescence in the views of the Protestant Church dignitary on this subject, and in reply to the Socialist indictment writes: —

We repudiate most emphatically the notion that there is anything in aerial warfare (which is, moreover, a perfectly legitimate means of attack, and, in our case, doubly justified for well-known reasons when applied to England) that Christianity can condemn. There can be absolutely no question of that. It is true that for the Christian war is a bitter and hard trial, ordained by God, and that he prays and implores God it may be brought to an end speedily. This cannot and must not, however, prevent the Christian regarding himself as the instrument of God in this same war, and from making use of all the permissible means at his disposal in order to gain victory for his nation and its just cause.

The Munich "Neueste Nachrichten" publishes a long telegram from its Berlin correspondent, who says: —

We shall continue to wage the aerial war against England as a war on fortified or otherwise defended positions and on military works as we have done heretofore. We have, however, prejudiced the success of our superior airship weapon by showing consideration as far as possible for peaceable dwellings and art works in the neighborhood. Although Zeppelins have flown over all parts of London they have restricted their attacks to the port and docks, to Woolwich Arsenal, and to factories for military requirements in other districts. Zeppelins will not, also, in future deliberately aim at art collections or at buildings artistically valuable, but, as all appeals to their better feeling and fairmindedness have proved unavailing, we have determined to speak to the English in language they will perhaps understand better. Who will not hear must feel.

Even the "Kreuz Zeitung," one of the most serious papers of Berlin, believes that the English newspapers

print two editions, one with the truth about the Zeppelin raids for home consumption, and another version for foreign countries which conceal the damage done.

Herr Oskar Schweriner, who supplies the "Vossische Zeitung" with inventions from Amsterdam, seems to have discovered that neutrals do not believe the German official lies about Zeppelin raids on England. He says that the neutrals read the German reports, then read the telegraphed denials from England, and then look at the English newspapers. They argue that it would be utterly impossible for the British authorities to deny the truth day after day in the British press, and they come to the conclusion that the Germans are lying. Schweriner is ready with an explanation. He solemnly declares that only specially prepared editions of the London papers are sent abroad — inappropriate news being taken out of the London editions, and the "Zeppelin reports" being inserted instead. He explains that "anybody who understands newspaper production knows that this is a trifling matter, which takes only a few minutes."

It has remained at last for Schweriner to expose "the facts which the British Press Department has hitherto succeeded, by the employment of all its resources, in keeping secret."

One of the best-informed American correspondents is Von Wiegand, of the New York "World." After describing a new and more powerful type of Zeppelin that is expected to be able to cross the Atlantic, he adds this consoling remark for the Irish: —

> I learn that Ireland is outside the zone prescribed for Zeppelin attacks; that so far as Zeppelins are concerned Ireland is not regarded as enemy territory.

What is the truth about the Zeppelin raids? Personally, I examined the results of several raids that occurred while I was in England. The damage was wholly negligible. I had German and English official reports in my hands. I found no inaccuracy in the English reports. I never found a truthful statement in the German reports. Three times as many people were killed by vehicles and street-cars in New York City, in the last two and a half years, as were killed by Zeppelins in the same time. The number killed by accident in New York City in two years is twelve times the number killed by the Zeppelins in all their raids. The German official and newspaper reports are pure fantasy, and everybody in England knows it.

What is the effect of the Zeppelin raids?

First of all, there has been no destruction of life or property of any military importance.

Second: They brought the war home to the British people, and were one of the chief causes that led in two years to the raising of five million volunteers.

Third: The German reports, which are republished fully and in all the newspapers, lead the English people to judge all statements made by the German Government as of doubtful credibility.

I can close this study of the Zeppelin myth in a fitting manner with an extract from a poem, entitled "Battle Prayer," by Pastor Dietrich Vorwerk: —

> "Oh, Thou, who art enthroned on high,
> Above Cherubim, Seraphim, and Zeppelins,
> Thou whose sword is the lightning,
> And whose cannon the thunder,
> Send down thunder, lightning, hail and tempest
> Upon the heads of our foes,
> And hurl them headlong
> Into the dark death-pits."

CHAPTER X

THE GERMAN ARMY IN BELGIUM ACCORDING TO GERMAN DOCUMENTS

THE essential part of the German doctrine of war is contained in the following passages from Clausewitz:—

Whoever uses force, *without any consideration and without sparing blood*, has sooner or later the advantage if the enemy does not proceed in the same way. *One cannot introduce a principle of moderation into the philosophy of war without committing an absurdity.*

It is a vain and erroneous tendency to wish to neglect the element of brutality in war merely because we dislike it.

Half a century afterwards his pupil Von Hartmann annotates his teaching for the benefit of our contemporaries:—

It would be giving ourselves up lightheartedly to a chimera not to realize that war in the present day will have to be conducted *more recklessly, less scrupulously*, more violently, more ruthlessly, than ever in the past. . . .

The official "Kriegsbrauch im Landkriege" says:—

But since the tendency of thought of the last century was dominated essentially by humanitarian considerations which not infrequently degenerated into sentimentality and flabby emotion there have not been wanting attempts to influence the development of the usages of war in a way which was in fundamental contradiction with the nature of war and its object. Attempts of this kind will also not be wanting in the future, the more so as these agitations have found a kind of moral recognition in some provisions of the Geneva Convention and the Brussels and Hague Conferences.

Moreover, the officer is a child of his time. He is subject

to the intellectual tendencies which influence his own nation; the more educated he is the more will this be the case. . . . By steeping himself in military history an officer will be able to guard himself against excessive humanitarian notions; it will teach him that certain severities are indispensable to war, nay more, that the only true humanity very often lies in a ruthless application of them. . . .

Von Hartmann continues: —

Every restriction on acts of war, once military operations have begun, tends to weaken the coördinated action of the belligerent. *The law of nations must beware of paralyzing military action by placing fetters upon it.* . . .

The term "civilized war" as employed by Bluntschli seems hardly intelligible. . . . It leads to an irreducible contradiction. . . .

Distress and damage to the enemy are the conditions necessary to bend and break his will. The efficacy of these methods constitutes their undeniable justification, since by them one can attain with certainty an exactly defined military aim.

Further Von Hartmann says: —

The combatant has need of passion. . . . All military effort requires that the combatant who makes this effort *shall be entirely freed from the shackles of a constraining legality which is in all respects oppressive.* . . . *Violence* and *passion* are the two principal levers of every warlike act, and let us say it without fear, of all *warlike greatness.*

The great General Staff declares: —

Every means of war without which the object of the war cannot be obtained is permissible. . . . *It follows from these universally valid principles that wide limits are set to the subjective freedom and arbitrary judgment of the Commanding Officer.*

Germany's principles of war are explained more concretely in an article that was published February 10,

1915, in the "Kölnische Zeitung" by the adjutant to the Governor-General of Belgium, Captain Walter Bloem, as follows:—

This principle finds its justification in the theory of terror. The innocent must suffer simultaneously with the guilty, and, if the latter cannot be discovered, instead and in the place of the latter; this punishment is not inflicted because a crime has been committed, but in order that no further crimes shall be committed. Every destruction of a village by fire, every execution of hostages, every case of the suppression of part of the population of a commune whose inhabitants have taken up arms against our troops, is far less an act of vengeance than a warning sign to the territory not as yet occupied.

And this cannot be doubted. The burning of Battice, Herve, Louvain, and Dinant was a series of warnings.

War is not a society diversion. It is an annex of hell. He who puts his finger in it burns his hand, his soul, and loses his life. It was thus that the poor Belgian people, blinded and led astray, fell a victim to it.

Extract from a Proclamation to the Municipal Authorities of the City of Liège

August 22, 1914.

The inhabitants of the town of Andenne, after having declared their peaceful intentions, have made a surprise attack on our troops.

It is with my consent that the Commander-in-Chief has ordered the whole town to be burned and that about one hundred people have been shot.

I bring this fact to the knowledge of the city of Liège, so that citizens of Liège may realize the fate with which they are menaced if they adopt a similar attitude.

The General Commanding in Chief.
(Signed) Von Bülow.

Notice posted at Namur, August 25, 1914

(1) French and Belgian soldiers must be surrendered as prisoners of war at the prison before four o'clock. Citizens who do not obey will be condemned to enforced labor for life in Germany.

A rigorous inspection of houses will begin at four o'clock. Every soldier found will be immediately shot.

(2) Arms, powder, dynamite, must be surrendered at four o'clock. Penalty: death by shooting.

The citizens who know where a store of arms is located must inform the Burgomaster, under penalty of enforced labor for life.

(3) Each street will be occupied by a German guard who will take ten hostages in each street, whom they will keep in custody.

If any outrage is committed in the street, the ten hostages will be shot.

This illustrates the principle of destroying the innocent if the guilty cannot be found.

Letter addressed on August 27, 1914, by Lieutenant-General von Nieber to the Burgomaster of Wavre

On August 22, 1914, the General commanding the Second Army, Herr von Bülow, imposed upon the city of Wavre a war levy of three million francs, to be paid before September 1, as expiation for its unqualifiable behavior (contrary to the Law of Nations and the usages of war) in making a surprise attack on the German troops.

The General in command of the Second Army has just given to the General commanding this station of the Second Army the order to send in, without delay, this contribution which it should pay on account of its conduct.

I order and command you to give to the bearer of the present letter the two first instalments, that is to say, two million francs in gold.

Furthermore, I require that you give the bearer a letter

duly sealed with the seal of the city, stating that the balance, that is to say, one million francs, will be paid, without fail, on the first of September.

I draw the attention of the City to the fact that in no case can it count on further delay, as the civil population of the City has put itself outside the Law of Nations by firing on the German soldiers.

The City of Wavre will be burned and destroyed if the levy is not paid in due time, without regard for any one; the innocent will suffer with the guilty.

In a proclamation of September 8, 1914, signed "Dieckmann, Major in Command," appears the following: —

In order to be sure that this permission is not abused, the Burgomasters of Beyne-Heusay and of Grivegnée shall immediately draw up a list of persons who shall be held as hostages, at the fort of Fleron, in twenty-four-hour shifts; on September 6, for the first time, from six o'clock in the evening until midday, September 7.

The life of these hostages will depend upon the population of the aforesaid communes remaining pacific under all circumstances.

I will designate from the lists submitted to me the persons who will be detained as hostages from noon of one day to noon of the next day. If the substitute does not arrive in time, the hostage will remain another twenty-four hours. After this second period of twenty-four hours, the hostage incurs the penalty of death if the substitution is not made.

Hostages be will chosen, primarily, from among Priests, Burgomasters, and other members of the civic administration.

Notice posted at Brussels, November 1, 1914

A legally constituted Court Martial has pronounced, the 28th of October, 1914, the following condemnations: —

(1) Upon Policeman De Ryckere for attacking, in the exercise of his legal functions, an agent vested with German

authority, for willfully inflicting bodily injury on two occasions, in concert with other persons, for facilitating the escape of a prisoner, on one occasion, and for attacking a German soldier — Five years imprisonment.

(2) Upon Policeman Seghers for attacking, in the exercise of his legal functions, an agent vested with German authority, for willfully inflicting bodily injury upon said German agent, and for facilitating the escape of a prisoner (all these offenses constituting a single act) — Three years imprisonment.

These sentences have been confirmed by Governor General Baron von der Goltz, on October 31, 1914.

The city of Brussels, excluding suburbs, has been punished for the crime committed by its policeman De Ryckere against a German soldier by an additional fine of five million francs.

The Governor of Brussels,
(Signed) BARON VON LUETWITZ,
General.

Brussels, November 1, 1914.

Proclamation posted in Brussels, September 25, 1914
(General Government in Belgium)

It has happened recently, in some places which are not at the present time occupied by strong forces of German troops, military convoys or patrolling parties have been attacked by surprise by the inhabitants.

I draw the attention of the public to the fact that a record is kept of the towns and villages in the vicinity of which such attacks have taken place and that they must expect their punishment as soon as German troops pass near by.

The Governor-General of Belgium,
(Signed) BARON VON DER GOLTZ,
Field Marshal.

Brussels, 25th September.

Notice posted at Brussels, October 5, 1914, and presumably in most of the Communes in the country

On the evening of September 25, the railway and telegraph lines were destroyed on the Lovenjoul-Vertryck line.

Consequently, the two above-mentioned places, on the morning of September 30, had to give an account and to furnish hostages.

In the future, the communities in the vicinity of a place where such things happen (no matter whether or not they are accomplices) will be punished without mercy.

To this end, hostages have been taken from all places in the vicinity of railroad lines, menaced by such attacks, and, at the first attempt to destroy the railroad tracks or the telegraph or telephone wires, they will be immediately shot.

Furthermore, all troops in charge of the protection of the railroad lines have received orders to shoot any person approaching, in a suspicious manner, the railroad tracks or the telegraph or telephone lines.

The Governor-General of Belgium,
(Signed) BARON VON DER GOLTZ,
Field Marshal.

One must recall the fact that during the siege of Antwerp (which terminated only on the 9th of October) Belgian patrols were penetrating into the midst of the German troops, venturing thirty-five miles and more from Antwerp, their mission being to harass the enemy's communications and to destroy the railways and the telegraph and telephone lines. It was one of these bodies of Belgian cyclists which cut the railway and the telegraph line between Louvain and Tirlemont on September 25, 1914.

Notice

All damage done to the telegraph, telephone, or railway lines will be punished by the Military Court. According to

the circumstances, the guilty person will be condemned to death. If the guilty person is not seized the severest measures will be taken against the commune in which the damage has been done.

The General Government.[1]

On the 29th of August, 1914, at Munster, General von Bissing addressed the population of the seat of the Seventh Army Corps in a proclamation which contained the following words: —

If a blind and infuriated population miserably slaughters, in treacherous attacks, the valiant sons of our people, who go to meet death for their country, as well as the wounded, the medical officers, and the ambulance-bearers; if (armed) bands compromise the security of the armies on their rear, then self-preservation commands us, and it is a sacred duty on the part of military commandants, to combat them immediately by *extreme measures.* In such a case the innocent must suffer with the guilty. In their repeated *communiqués* the directors of our army have allowed no doubt to subsist in this respect. That in the repression of infamy human lives cannot be spared, and that isolated houses, flourishing villages and even entire towns are annihilated, is assuredly regrettable, but this must not excite ill-timed sentimentality. All this must not in our eyes weigh as much as the life of a single one of our brave soldiers. That is self-evident, and properly speaking, there is no need to say it. . . . Who speaks here of barbarism commits a crime. The rigorous accomplishment of duty is the emanation of a high KULTUR, and in that the population of the enemy countries can learn a lesson from our army.

As fresh attempts at assassination have been made upon persons forming part of the German army I have had persons from many localities arrested as hostages. These will guarantee with their lives that no inhabitant will again dare

[1] Printed by H. A. Heymann, Berlin, S.W. (Posted at Tervueren; copy made 15th of April, 1915.)

to commit a malevolent action against German soldiers or attempt to damage the railway, telegraph, or telephone line, or other objects useful to the operations of our army.

Persons not belonging to the army surprised in committing such actions will be shot or hanged. The hostages of the surrounding localities will suffer the same fate. I shall then have the neighborhood burned to the last house, even if important towns are in question. If the hostages attempt to escape, the locality to which they belong will be burned, and if captured the hostages will be hanged.

The Commandant entrusted with the Protection of the Railways,

FREIHERR VON MALZAHN.[1]

All civilized nations including Germany have signed certain agreements at The Hague, including the following: —

No collective penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible.

[1] Posted at Spa, Aywaille, Chatelineau . . . 17 August, 1914.

CHAPTER XI

ALLEGED ATROCITIES OF THE GERMAN TROOPS IN BELGIUM

THERE are certain facts that are accepted by Germany as well as by England and France: —

First: That Germany has stripped the Belgian people of nearly all their removable property.

Second: That by causing the provinces of Belgium to print currency to pay the monthly levy for the support of the army of occupation, by forcing upon Belgium the mark at a fixed rate of exchange, and further by actually removing from the banks the money of Belgium, Germany has Mexicanized the financial machinery and currency of Belgium.

Third: That during the invasion of Belgium, several thousand civilians were put to death, and many thousands taken as prisoners to Germany.

Fourth: That hundreds of thousands of Belgians have been deported to Germany in a manner that the world at large calls enslavement.

Fifth: That hundreds of thousands of Belgians in Belgium and in Germany are compelled to aid Germany in her war against Belgium.

All the above facts are substantiated by German authorities.

I. THE BELGIAN ALLEGATIONS

The student of the documents as to the so-called Belgian atrocities finds a formidable mass of material, but there are certain matters that can be cleared up only after the war.

I propose herewith to present objectively illustrative material from the best available data.

First, we feel on sure ground in the statements of Cardinal Mercier in his pastoral letter of Christmas, 1914: —

Belgium's unhappy fate.

Better than any other man, perhaps, do I know what our unhappy country has undergone. Nor will any Belgian, I trust, doubt of what I suffer in my soul as a citizen and as a Bishop, in sympathy with all this sorrow. These last four months have seemed to me an age long. By thousands have our brave ones been mowed down. Wives, mothers are weeping for those they shall not see again; hearts are desolate; dire poverty spreads, anguish increases.

At Malines, at Antwerp the people of two great cities have been given over, the one for six hours, the other for thirty-four hours, to a continuous bombardment, to the throes of death.

I have traversed the greater part of the districts most terribly devastated in my diocese, and the ruins I beheld, and the ashes, were more dreadful than I, prepared by the saddest of forebodings, could have imagined.

Other parts of my diocese, which I have not had time to visit have in like manner been laid waste. Churches, schools, asylums, hospitals, convents in great numbers are in ruins. Entire villages have all but disappeared. At Werchter-Wackerzeel, for instance, out of 380 homes 130 remain. At Tremeloo two thirds of the village are overthrown. At Bueken out of 100 houses, 20 are standing. At Schaffen 189 houses out of 200 are destroyed; 11 still stand. At Louvain the third part of the buildings are down; 1074 dwellings have disappeared. On the town land and in the suburbs 1623 houses have been burned.

The destruction at Louvain

In this dear city of Louvain, perpetually in my thoughts, the magnificent Church of St. Peter will never recover its

former splendor. The ancient College of St. Ives, the art schools, the consular and commercial schools of the University, the old markets, our rich library with its collections, its unique and unpublished manuscripts, its archives, its gallery of great portraits of illustrious rectors, chancellors, professors, dating from the time of its foundation, which preserved for masters and students alike a noble tradition, and were an incitement in their studies, all this accumulation of intellectual, of historic and of artistic riches, the fruit of the labors of five centuries — all is in the dust.

Many a parish lost its pastor. There is now sounding in my ears the sorrowful voice of an old man, of whom I asked whether he had mass on Sunday in his battered church. "It is two months," he said, "since we had a church." The parish priest and the curate had been interned in a concentration camp.

Hundreds of innocent men were shot. I possess no complete necrology; but I know that there were ninety-one shot at Aerschot and that there, under pain of death, their fellow citizens were compelled to dig their graves. In the Louvain group of communes 176 persons, men and women, old men and sucklings, were shot or burned.

List of some priests killed

In my diocese alone I know that thirteen priests were put to death. Their brothers in religion or in the priesthood will wish to know their names. Here they are: Dupierreux, of the Society of Jesus, Brothers Sebastian and Allard, of the Congregation of the Josephites, Brother Candide, of the Congregation of the Brothers of Mercy, Father Maximin, Capuchin, and Father Vincent, Conventual; Lombaerts, parish priest at Boven-Loo; Goris, Parish priest at Autgaerden; Carette, professor at the Episcopal College of Louvain; de Clerck, parish priest at Bueken; d'Argent, parish priest at Gelrode, and Wouters Jean, parish priest at Pont-Brûlé. We have reason to believe that the parish priest of Herenta, Van Bladel, an old man of seventy-one, was also killed. Until now, however, his body has not been found.

One of these, the parish priest of Gelrode, suffered, I believe, a veritable martyrdom. I made a pilgrimage to his grave, and amid the little flock which so lately he had been feeding with the zeal of an apostle, there did I pray to Him that from the height of Heaven He would guard His parish, His diocese, His country.

(I have said that thirteen ecclesiastics had been shot within the Diocese of Malines. There were, to my own actual personal knowledge, more than thirty in the Diocese of Namur, Tournai, and Liège:—Schlogel, parish priest of Hastière; Gille, parish priest of Couvin; Pieret, curate at Etalle; Alexandre, curate at Mussy-la-Ville; Marechal, seminarist at Maissin; the Reverend Father Gillet, Benedictine of Maredsous; the Reverend Father Nicolas, Premonstratensian of the Abbey of Leffe; two brothers of the same abbey; one brother of the Congregation of Oblates; Poskin, parish priest of Surice; Hotlet, parish priest of Les Alloux; Georges, parish priest of Tintigny; Glouden, parish priest of Latour; Zenden, retired parish priest at Latout; Jacques, a priest; Druet, parish priest of Acoz; Hollart, parish priest of Roselies; Labeye, parish priest of Biegny-Trembleur; Thielen, parish priest of Haccourt; Janssen, parish priest of Heure le Romain; Chabot, parish priest of Foret; Dossogne, parish priest of Hockay; Reusonnet, curate of Olme; Bilande, chaplain of the Institute of Deaf Mutes at Bouge; Docq, a priest, and others of God.)

Priests did not incite civilians

Wherever it has been possible I have questioned our people, our clergy, and particularly a considerable number of priests who had been deported to German prisons, but whom a principle of humanity, to which I gladly render homage, has since set at liberty. Well, I affirm, upon my honor, and I am prepared to assert upon faith of my oath, that until now I have not met a single ecclesiastic, secular or regular, who had once incited civilians to bear arms against the enemy. All have loyally followed the instructions of their Bishops, given in the early days of August, to the effect that

they were to use their moral influence over the civil population so that order might be preserved and military regulations observed.

Until the German Government is able to prove that these priests violated the rules of war the whole world will agree with Cardinal Mercier.

There is also a little book entitled The "Germans in Belgium," by a Dutch professor, L. H. Grondys, Ph.D. of the Technical Institute of Dordrecht. He was present at the sack of Louvain. Here are illustrative paragraphs: —

Germans told me that the bombardment was to commence at noon, and that the town must be evacuated before that hour. Some nuns, alarmed, but still quite self-possessed, were making for their convents without undue haste. In the Rue de Namur I was accosted by the Professor of History at the University, Canon Cauchie, to whom I had formerly been introduced. He begged me to accompany him and Mgr. Ladeuze to Brussels. I promised to rejoin these two venerable gentlemen at the house of the Rector.

Indescribable confusion reigned in the Rue des Moutons. Pale as death, the orphans were marching in an irregular troop. On a wheelbarrow, pushed by a little old man, lay a nonagenarian nun. The crowd showed immense terror and a wildness that boded ill.

The Germans ordered the whole population to go towards the station. The majority did just the contrary, and fled in the direction of Mechlin and Brussels. All, men and women alike, who took the road indicated to them by the Germans were to be imprisoned and transported to Germany. While I helped M. Scharpé to carry his most precious treasures to the cellar, the Professor told me he had vainly besought the Commandant to spare our quarter, where nothing reprehensible had occurred. Major von Manteuffel flatly refused. The whole town was to pay for the pretended misdeeds committed by some of the citizens.

In discussing the causes of the sack of Louvain Professor Grondys gives the results of careful investigations by himself; he says: —

The Germans assert that inhabitants fired on them on the evening of August 25. They explain, accordingly, their conduct at Louvain as a simple application of their abominable theory which renders whole communities responsible for alleged violence committed by one of their number.

The Belgians say, on the contrary, that no inhabitant of Louvain fired on the troops. The Germans, according to them, sought a trivial pretext to be able, without the shadow of excuse, to carry out a coldly premeditated project.

I have often discussed this question with German officers, and particularly with Doctors of Law, mobilized in their army.

They have had to admit that in all these affairs none of the rules necessary for the constitution of judicial proof were observed. Even in officers who might have wished to proceed in regular fashion against the accused, the precepts of the supreme German Staff soon weakened the sense of justice. Why long interrogatories, which mean considerable loss of precious time, when the accused is guilty, inasmuch as he is an inhabitant of a commune all of whose members are responsible for the misdeeds committed by one of their number?

At Louvain houses were fired into indiscriminately. Citizens were seized on all hands, and, without even seeking any proof of their guilt, private soldiers shot them in their homes. The soldiers themselves have told me so. I need not reproduce all their conversations. I need only certify that their poor intelligences were able to draw the unavoidable logical conclusions from the German theory, newly invented, as to responsibility in time of war. This theory gives them in advance entire absolution for all the injustice, no matter how cruel, they may commit. The enormous value of the simplest German warrior is such that if a soldier is killed in a town, the town is accursed, and all its inhabitants lose their right to live.

As a result of an interrogatory of German prisoners of war in France, it is established that among a column which passed through the town of Louvain after the first day of disaster a panic occurred because of a rifle-shot which rang out. The rumor immediately spread that a soldier had been killed by a civilian. Forthwith the troops began firing into the houses. Enormous excitement and great disorder prevailed for some time, until it was discovered that no soldier had been wounded. Suppose that in this tumult a soldier had been killed by his brothers-in-arms seized with excessive nervousness, a new legend would then have been added to the others!

It seems that during the evening of August 25 a similar panic seized the garrison of Louvain. The reader must remember that during the afternoon of that day the Belgian army was approaching the town. A part of the garrison started out to meet it; the rest of the garrison, awaiting reinforcements, which arrived in the course of the night, certainly spent hours of anxiety. At nightfall the troops, which had started some hours previously, returned to the town. A large number of witnesses declare that those who remained in the city mistook their identity and fired on their brothers-in-arms. It is quite possible that during these skirmishes the returning troops imagined they were being attacked by civilians, and this is all the more probable as the garrison showed little zeal in enlightening them.

So far one may admit the good faith of the soldiers. Now, however, comes in the German military theory as to reprisals in time of war. If the troops attacked by alleged civilians cannot distinguish their actual assailants, why, then, so much the worse for the others! The whole community is responsible. This doctrine, adopted by university professors, has been promulgated by German generals in proclamations affixed to all the walls. Thus the devastation of Louvain is nothing but the logical consequence of a dangerous juridical paradox which is taught seriously nowhere in the world but in Germany. And the soldiers who entered houses and in their fury killed men in the presence of their wives and chil-

dren, without proof and without question — these malefactors are guilty of nothing but a breach of discipline.

During the days preceding the disaster I was able to see that the people nourished no designs of vengeance. I spoke with professors, shopkeepers, people generally, and I found among them, if not a spirit of perfect submission caused by the executions at Aerschot, Linden, Haelen, etc., at least a pronounced intention to await quietly the expected victory of the Allies. The persons to whom I spoke had confidence in me, and for that matter, they showed it by the communications they made me.

One piece of evidence of special gravity confirmed my conclusions. Two leading men of Louvain, who are worthy of entire confidence, told me that on the morning of August 26, while walking in the garden of one of them (Rue de Namur), they heard close to them a fusillade that lasted twenty minutes. Mounting a ladder, they saw, behind the wall which ran round the garden, two German soldiers, hidden among trees, firing into the street — if I am not mistaken, the Rue des Moutons. Their shots appeared to proceed from the houses, and the soldiers who passed by must have thought that the inhabitants were firing at them.

The same evening I saw in the street, at the place where the soldiers had fired, the corpses of two horses still saddled. Most of the fugitives who left the town next day must have noticed these. Later, at Brussels, an officer told me that at Louvain two officers on horseback had been killed by civilians, and that this was why the authorities decided to burn the town.

When it began to burn, the Germans observed in the population a state of feeling which alarmed them. It has been thought that the chief object of the Germans in burning Louvain was to warn the people of Brussels that a similar fate awaited them in case of rebellion. This supposition is, perhaps, confirmed by the threat made at Creil and Senlis by German officers: "We will burn Senlis to the ground to warn the Parisians." And certainly at Senlis there was no motive for bombarding the cathedral and burning two or three streets.

Professor Grondys describes the horrors of the flight from Louvain. He gives the following illustration of the special hostility of the Germans against priests: —

German troops and the priests of Louvain in the field of Tervueren

I was the more eager to intervene in favor of my traveling companions, as the meadow in which they were herded had just been the scene of the execution of a priest, and anything was to be feared from the soldiers in their then frame of mind.

While I was talking with the Major we were told that a priest carrying compromising papers had been shot. I determined to find out all I could about the occurrence. This is what I learned from eye-witnesses whose evidence I was able to test.

Among the inhabitants of Louvain who were flying towards Brussels, only those who wore the ecclesiastical habit were arrested. The guard of Tervueren first apprehended some thirty priests, among whom were Mgr. de Becker, Principal of the American College of Louvain, and Mgr. Willemson, the late Rector of the same College, since appointed to Rome, but temporarily at Louvain, and several Jesuit Fathers. Their pockets and valises were searched. Nothing suspicious was found except on one of the younger Jesuits, Père Dupierreux, a little notebook bearing the following note in French: —

> When formerly I read that the Huns under Attila had devastated towns, and that the Arabs had burned the Library of Alexandria, I smiled. Now that I have seen with my own eyes the hordes of to-day, burning churches and the celebrated Library of Louvain, I smile no longer.

This Jesuit Father had a praiseworthy habit of noting his impressions in this manner. But to have this reproachful

reflection in one's pocket in war-time was an imprudence for which the poor priest was made to pay in tragic fashion.

Before the assembled troops, the thirty priests were drawn up in a semicircle round the unfortunate Jesuit. The note was first read in French, and then translated into German. The priest who was reading it was interrupted by the exclamations of the soldiers. The Lieutenant announced that incitement to murder being proved, the Father would be shot at once. He was allowed to confess. After confession, his eyes were bound.

The priests were told to wheel round. The firing party advanced. The order was given, and the shots rang out. The other priests were made to watch the death agony of the unhappy man. When he was dead, they were ordered to bury him on the spot.

After that, the Lieutenant read the following proclamation: —

> In the name of the Emperor, I arrest you as hostages, to be conveyed with our column across Belgium. If a single shot is fired by the population on our troops, you will all be killed.

I have quoted at some length from Professor Grondys, because he was on the spot, was a neutral, and writes with clarity and convincingness.

There is another book, this time by a Belgian journalist, Gustave Somville. It is confined to the events between the invasion of Belgium and the capture of Liège. It deals only with events in August, 1914. Mr. Somville at considerable personal risk followed the invading armies, and in some cases visited towns within a few hours after the occurrence of the events he narrates. He gives lists, with age and sex, of the civilians killed in those early days. I quote from the pages of the book to illustrate its character: —

Francorchamps

Francorchamps (*Francorum campus*) is a summer resort. The German army began to pass through it on the morning of the 4th. It was at the news of the check inflicted upon them before the forts that their fury broke forth. Murders and cases of incendiarism date, for the most part, from Saturday the 8th and Friday the 14th; that is, from after the vigorous resistance of the Belgian army, and the second refusal of Belgium to agree to the German proposals.

On Saturday the 8th, no one knowing why, the troops began to fire into the windows, seizing the inhabitants, and shooting, we are told, thirteen; three of whom were women. The whole population took flight, and the troops pillaged the houses, carried off the wine from the Hôtel des Fagnes, etc. In the courtyard of the hotel a woman of sixty-five, Madame Bovy, happened to be coming forward with a jug of milk for the soldiers; the latter shot her, to pretend, later on, that she had fired upon the troops.

Other tragic incidents were recorded. A young girl carrying a child was wounded by several bullets: the child was killed in her arms.

M. Laude, an advocate of Brussels, who was taking a holiday at Francorchamps, fled, with his family, when the shooting of inhabitants began; they took refuge in a cellar. The Germans pillaged the ground floor and were trying to break in the cellar door; M. Laude and his brother-in-law went to open; they were shot down; the women and children were violently expelled; one woman gave birth to a child in the course of the flight. M. Laude's body was afterwards found in the ruins, carbonized; his brother-in-law's corpse was lying in the garden.

Some of the inhabitants were led to a spot near a brick-field, and were shot. Finally, the inhabitants were themselves forced to load the stolen articles of furniture, which were sent into Germany. The remainder was broken, to render it useless, or thrown into the fire.

Hockay

Hockay is a hamlet of Francorchamps, almost level with the Baraque Michel, the highest point of Belgium.

The curé, who was rather an oddity, was a Germanophile. The invaders fired on the houses in passing, pretending that a shot had been fired from the tower of the little church. They burned three houses and pillaged others. They executed a M. Cloes, who protested that his fellow-citizens were innocent; and they announced that other executions were to follow.

The curé presented himself. "If a victim is required," he said, "let it be myself!" He was seized; they dragged him to Tiège (Sart), beating him unmercifully and subjecting him to every insult. "It was he who fired," cried a soldier; "I saw him; he fired ten times!" In spite of immediate intervention and courageous protest on the part of numerous inhabitants, the devoted priest was shot.

Lincé

Until the morning unspeakable scenes were enacted in all directions. . . .

After many vicissitudes the inhabitants arrested were taken to the field of execution. Sixteen or seventeen were shot there.

. . . Thus perished those whom the people of Lincé, inconsolable at their loss, declare to have been the flower of the population. For truly it seems as though misfortune had descended most implacably upon the most upright and beneficent.

These were the victims of Lincé: —

Félicien Balthazar	11 years	Nicolas Ninane	74 years
Gérard Mathieu	16	Joseph Radoux	65
Nicolas Mathieu	25	Mathieu Quoilin	17
Alfred Pahaut	31	Alphonse Servais	9
Pirmez-de Looz	48	Mathieu Dognée	75
R. Pirmez-du Monceau	24	Joseph Graffaux	39
Melchior Nandrin	67	Eugène Grignard	54
Ulrich Nandrin	35	Alphonse Lebir	43

Auguste Moureau	50 years	Victor Lebir	36 years
Joseph Moreau	51	Lucien Lejeune	32
Alfred Duperon	52	Nicolas Lemaire	69
Léon Boulanger	49	Joseph Delrez	50
Victor Briffot	32	Julien Derenne	45
Émile Delmotte	36	Émile Pingret	59
Célestin Delcommune	66	Hubert Masson	55
Alphonse Delcommune	61	Raymond Flagothier	26
Jean Bertrand	59		

Louveigné: the bloody fortnight

An old soldier said: "Yesterday we got a terrible drubbing in front of the forts of Liège." The Germans, indeed, wore a gloomy and infuriated air. At noon those arrived who had been burning and killing at Lincé. They looted the drink-shops, unhappily numerous; soon many soldiers were in a state of intoxication. Shots were fired, to the right, to the left; and the officers began to shout: "The civilians are firing; there are *francs-tireurs* here!"

It was an insane idea. For three days the inhabitants had not ceased to provide the Germans with everything they desired; they were overrun with the latter to such an extent that if any one had conceived the crazy idea of attacking them, he could not have put it into execution without being taken in the act.

The inhabitants protested: —

"No; no one could have fired. Where has any one fired from?"

"There!" said the Germans, pointing; "some one fired from that house."

It was the house of M. Léonard Charlier, who had left the day before.

"But there is no one there!"

"That makes no difference!"

The house was fired, and was soon in flames.

A dozen men were arrested, among them men of seventy-four and eighty years of age, and, as always, the curé of the parish. They were struck and kicked, and forced to hold their hands in the air; they were threatened with death.

The men were led out to be shot, despite the tears and protests of the women and the cries of the children. They were crowded into a little forge, situated at the northwest angle of the cross-roads. About half-past six they were told: "Go now, but on the run, or else . . ." The unfortunate men ran, and the Germans amused themselves by bringing them down with the rifle. A few escaped death by crouching at the bottom of a ditch or drain.

At seven in the evening the incendiaries got to work, with benzine, tar, incendiary lozenges, and rockets — all the customary means employed by the German army. Women and children fled, distracted. The central portion of the commune was a furnace.

On the 15th the Germans murdered two young men who were quietly walking through the village.

Here is the list of the inhabitants massacred, with their approximate ages. The majority left widows and orphans.

Adam, Alfred, 52 years.
Sluse, Joseph, communal councilor
Sluse, Joseph, 45 years, carpenter.
Sluse, Léon, 17 years.
Kansy, Joseph, 33 years.
Dethier, Arnold, 80 years.
Delhase, Joseph, 33 years, butcher.
Delhasse, J., 30 years, farmer.
Collette, Marcel, 25 years.
Kerf, Louis, 35 years.
Harmant, Martial, 28 years.
Méan-Dethiers, Hélène, 40 years.
Deenil, 70 years.
Thonon, Joseph, 29 years.
Bonnesire, Hadelin, 30 years.
Dejong, Albert, 28 years.
Dejong, Joseph, 30 years.
Dejong, Georges, 17 years.
Collard, Lucien, 24 years.
Grandry, Eugène, 37 years.
Cornet, Victor, postman.
Ancion, Camille, 25 years.
Delrez, Geneviève, 25 years, wife of Martial Harmant.
Defaaz, Joseph, 32 years.

And four others not identified, doubtless strangers to the commune.

Or a total of twenty-eight victims.

Victor Cornet, postman, was pierced with bayonet wounds before he was shot. Madame Méan, who was infirm, was asphyxiated in a cellar. The three Dejongs were brothers. Delhase, butcher, was killed by saber cuts.

Young Léon Sluse was put to death at Theux, after having been tortured all along the road thither.

On the 9th of February, 1915, the Germans opened an inquiry at Louveigné, seeking in vain to discover an act of aggression on the part of the inhabitants.

Mélen-la-Bouxhe: a scene of extermination

Neither on this day nor on Wednesday was any definite accusation brought against the villagers. Even the usual "*Man hat geschossen!*" was not uttered. There were horrible scenes; one has not the heart to record them. The list of the victims' names will tell more than any narrative.

I quote only names of women from the list of eighty-one victims of Mélen-la-Bouxhe: —

Benoit, Marie, 12 years.
Brayeur, Marie, née Weyenberg, 38 years, wife of Brayeur.
Brayeur, Anna, their daughter, 12 years.
Cresson, Marie, née Franck, 40 years, wife of André Cresson.
Cresson, Thérèse, 11 years.
Cresson, Catherine, 7 years.
Degueldre, Marie, 18 years, daughter of Olivier, shot and her body burned to ashes.
Rouschops, Marie, née Kusters, 42 years, wife of Pierre; their child of 5 was saved, but had two fingers almost severed.
Wislet, Marie, his wife, née Dupont, 41 years, wife of Louie Wislet.
Wislet, Marguerite, 20 years, shot and her skull smashed open with the rifle-butt.

The massacre of Saint-Hadelin (Olne)

If there ever was a peaceful spot it was this picturesque hamlet of Saint-Hadelin, hidden away in a fold of the hills, and away from the frequented roads. Well, the Germans discovered it, and they made of it a place of massacre and horror.

The inhabitants of Saint-Hadelin ingenuously trusted the soldiers. War was the conflict of two armies, nothing more.

Yet as early as the 5th of August there had been acts of violence in the neighborhood; it was learned that there had been victims at Forêt, and it was said in some quarters that young men had been butchered in the fields near Soumagne.

People began to foresee that the troops would soon become violent.

Part of the population took refuge in the church and in M. Jamme's old weaving-shed. . . .

The Fléron fort continued to fire. At eleven o'clock a shell fell with a crash in front of the school, killing a horse and wounding several men. Upon this the Germans became furious. They entered the house of the schoolmaster, M. Warnier, and arrested him, with all his family, as also the keeper, Jean Naval.

"They have fired," said the Germans. "Who has warned the fort of our presence here?"

M. Warnier replied: "The fort is two miles from here. No one could have warned them."

But they would listen to nothing. With an accompaniment of insults and brutalities, M. Warnier was pushed along towards the little chapel close by. His wife followed him, a young child in her arms, pleading and beseeching. She was driven back by blows of the Germans' rifle-butts. Her face covered with blood, she continued to plead, but in vain.

Her husband was shot before her eyes; then, in the midst of a scene of unspeakable savagery, she witnessed the murder of her children. Her two boys fell dead; her young daughters were next to be shot down. Bertha lay under the body of Nelly, who was mortally wounded; for fifteen minutes she heard her dying struggle for breath, and felt her die. Grievously wounded herself, and with a broken arm, she was conscious of the whole hideous drama. Motionless, she heard the cries of Madame Naval, who fell fainting as the Germans were about to shoot her husband, Jean Naval, while their little boy, only five or six years old, pleaded with them: "Mister soldier, don't hurt papa; he did n't do anything; he's so good."

Some people of that hamlet came forward in all simplicity, bringing provisions, — such, at least, it was proved, was the case with Gillet, Dhanen, Dethier, Maguet, and the Dewandres. All were upright and peaceable men; Maguet was the model of the village, a man of generous and worthy

character; while the Dewandres were handsome young men, noted for their good hearts and obliging nature. They were added to the rest, and now there were a hundred persons awaiting death. The execution was carried out by small batches, at the spot known as the Ash-Tree.

One of the doomed men, M. Polet of Ayeneux, a retired schoolmaster, a man of high character, was revolted by the cowardice of the executioners. When he was ordered to take up his position for execution, the old man refused with disdain; he was shot on the little hillock on which he stood, in an attitude full of dignity and courage.

Survivors report that before the shooting began, Jacques Maguet, turning to the whole group of prisoners, recited in a loud, firm voice the act of contrition, which all repeated, sentence by sentence. Then, when his turn had come, and he was being pushed, with others, toward the place of execution, Maguet raised his hat and shouted: "Vive la Belgique!" "Vive la Belgique!" repeated his companions, as though electrified. And the patriotic cry was raised again.

"Listen to your companions cheering!" said an officer, who stood some distance away; he was greatly moved. But the demonstration merely increased the rage of the other Germans; they began to bawl insults at the Belgians.

"Ah!" said one of the survivors, "when we heard that shout, *Vive la Belgique!* we felt a shiver run through our whole being; we plucked up courage, feeling that we, too, like our brave soldiers, were dying for our country."

The following incident is given on page 125 of Mr. Somville's book: —

While Hopa was led away towards Liège, his wife remained with the five children. All five were found, burned to ashes, in the remains of their house. It seems clear that this monstrous crime was intentional. "I was being taken away by the Germans," says a witness. "It was dark. As we passed the Hopas' house, the officer gave his men the order to fire and enter the house. Then I heard the shrieks

of the women and children, while some one said, 'Set fire to the place!'"

It was the same with the neighboring house, the Lefins'; and there, too, the father had been carried off. The mother remained with the child; they perished in the flames.

In the mean time, at the spot known as Les Communes, the Germans had killed or burned twenty-eight persons. Here are the names of these victims: —

Léonard Bony, 34 years.
Alexandrine Vieillevoie, his wife, 34 years.
Hubertine, their daughter, 2 years.
Gérard Mélotte, 56 years.
Armand Perrick, 25 years.
Joseph Labeye, 51 years, and his two sons.
Jean-Denis Labeye, 20 years.
Mathieu Labeye, 19 years.
Mathieu Renier, 52 years.
Thérèse Renier, his daughter, 20 years.
Olivier Renier, his son, 19 years.
Noël Outers, 70 years.
Fagard, senior, missing.
Gérard Lehane, 19 years.
François Lehane, brother of Gérard, 17 years.
Louis Lehane, brother of Gérard and François, 12 years.
Jacques Flamand, of Heuseaux, Marie Leers, his wife, and their father, aged 94.
Ida Froidmont, wife of Th. Rensonnet.
Henry Rensonnet, her son, 25 years.
Daniel Bourdouxhe, 76 years and Marguerite Mawet, his wife, 75 years.
Joséphine Bourdouxhe, 27 years, their daughter, married.
Her two daughters, aged 2 and 5 years.

There were ninety houses burned in Barchon during this terrible night. The few that remained were plundered by the soldiers and are half destroyed.

Those who were killed — all innocent victims — met their death in various ways. Some were transfixed by the bayonet as they opened the door to the soldiers who were battering at it; others were killed in their gardens, or on the road, or wherever they had sought a refuge; many were caught in the flames or were THROWN INTO THEM.

And so for nearly three hundred pages.

There is a great mass of material consisting of diaries and letters of German soldiers. In the archives of the French Government I saw a collection of six hundred diaries and thousands of letters which had

been taken, I was told, from German prisoners, or dead German soldiers.

Under the title "Germany's Violation of the Laws of War" the French Government has reproduced some of these documents in facsimile. Here are some specimens: —

Extract from the notebook of Private Fritz Krain, of the 4th Battalion of Light Horse (Reserve), 4th Reserve Corps, concerning the murder of a young girl.

Carried off four bottles of wine in my bag. Our first bivouac in France. There will soon be a battle, I hope. When we went to fetch water we encountered a girl with a revolver. Shot her dead and took her revolver.

Extract from the notebook of Private Menge, of the 74th Regiment of Infantry (Reserve), 10th Reserve Corps, recording the hanging of a Belgian priest and his sister.

Saturday, August 15. Marched from Elsenborn. Giving three cheers for our Emperor and singing *Deutschland über Alles*, we crossed the Belgian frontier. All trees cut down to serve as barricades. A parish priest and his sister hanged. Houses burnt.

Extract from the notebook of Max Peich, 17th Regiment of Infantry, 14th Army Corps, recording the murder of three men and a boy at Fumay (Ardennes).

August 24th. The brick-works were searched once more and three men and a youngster were brought out of one of the kilns. They were shot forthwith.

Extract from the notebook of Private Philipp, of the 178th Regiment of Infantry, 12th Army Corps, describing the massacre of the civil population in a village near Dinant.

At 10 o'clock in the evening the first battalion of the 178th marched down the steep incline into the burning village to

the north of Dinant. A terrific spectacle of ghastly beauty. At the entrance to the village lay about fifty dead civilians, shot for having fired upon our troops from ambush. In the course of the night many others were also shot, so that we counted over two hundred. Women and children, lamp in hand, were forced to look on at the horrible scene. We ate our rice later on in the midst of the corpses, for we had had nothing since morning. When we searched the houses we found plenty of wine and spirit, but no eatables. Captain Hamann was drunk. [This last phrase in shorthand.]

Extract from the notebook of Lieutenant Reisland, of the 117th Regiment of Infantry, 12th Army Corps, describing the burning of several villages in Belgium.

August 25, 1914. More burning. A village perched on a height was almost entirely in flames. When I saw it in the distance, I thought of the burning of Valhalla in the *Götterdämmerung*. A magnificent, but heartrending sight.

Extract from the notebook of an anonymous soldier of the 11th Battalion of Light Infantry, 11th Army Corps, concerning massacres at Leffe and Dinant.

At Leffe nineteen civilians shot. Women begging for mercy as we marched towards the Meuse.

Ten more men have been shot. The King having directed the people to defend the country by all possible means, we have received orders to shoot the entire male population.

At 2 P.M. furious rifle and cannon fire and awful heavy artillery fire on the Meuse.

At Dinant about one hundred men or more were huddled together and shot. A horrible Sunday.

Extract from the notebook of Private Karl Scheufele of the 3rd Bavarian Regiment of Landwehr Infantry, describing the burning of Saint-Maurice (Meurthe-et-Moselle) and its inhabitants.

In the night of August 18–19, the village of Saint-Maurice was punished for having fired on German soldiers, by being

burnt to the ground by the German troops (two regiments, the 12th Landwehr and the 17th). The village was surrounded, men posted about a yard from one another, so that no one could get out. Then the Uhlans set fire to it, house by house. Neither man, woman, nor child could escape; only the greater part of the live stock we carried off, as that could be used. Any one who ventured to come out was shot down. All the inhabitants left in the village were burnt with the houses.

Extract from the notebook of Private Max Thomas, of the 107th Regiment of Infantry (8th Saxons), 19th Army Corps, describing the crimes committed by the German troops at Spontin (Belgium).

August 23, Spontin. A company of the 107th and 108th had orders to stay behind and search the village, take the inhabitants prisoners, and burn the houses. At the entrance to the village, on the right, lay two young girls, one dead, the other severely wounded. The priest too was shot in front of the station. Thirty other men were shot according to martial law, and fifty were made prisoners.

Extract from the diary of Fr. Treinen, a volunteer enlisted in the 237th Regiment of Infantry (Reserve), describing the murder of a young man near Roulers (Belgium).

October 19, 1914. The owners of this property, rich and distinguished-looking people, fill the air with their lamentations and call upon the mercy of God. We make a search and find a revolver on the person of a young man of twenty-one. Screaming with terror he is dragged out to the front of the farmhouse and there shot before the eyes of his parents and brothers and sisters.

The sight was more than I could stand. After that a light was put to the splendid barn and everything was destroyed.

Extract from the notebook of Private Willmer of the 40th Brigade, Ersatz Battalion, 10th Division, Ersatz Corps, recording the plundering of Champenoux, at Brin (Meurthe-et-Moselle), and at Loupmont (Meuse).

September 5. In the village of Champenoux — between the lines (station) Brin, looted busily. Some rare things as booty, ham and bacon, and above all wine. The village was a pitiable sight. Bombarded. . . . Wine and more wine. Sacks and cases full. Even wineglasses. The soldiers of every arm shared in the spoils, and plundered to the music of the shells.

October 5. At Loupmont a fine country house, beautiful room with Persian carpet: slaughtered sow on it; in the bed sucking-pig also slaughtered. Blood running down the stairs.

Diary of a Saxon officer (unsigned) 178th Regiment, 88th Army Corps (Saxon Corps).

"26th August. The pretty village of Gue-d'Hossus in the Ardennes has been burnt, although innocent of any crime, it seemed to me. I was told a cyclist had fallen off his machine, and that in doing so his gun had gone off: so they fired in his direction. Thereupon, the male inhabitants were simply consigned to the flames. It is to be hoped that such atrocities will not be repeated.

' Langeviller, 22d August. Village destroyed by the 11th Battalion of the Pioneers. Three women hanged on trees: the first dead I have seen. . . .

In this way we destroyed eight houses with their inmates. In one of them two men with their wives and a girl of eighteen were bayoneted. The little one almost unnerved me, so innocent was her expression. But it was impossible to check the crowd, so excited were they, for in such moments you are no longer men, but wild beasts.

When I was in Belgium (February, 1916) I was told about a mass of documents and material collected by Professor Jean Massart, of the Royal Academy of

Belgium. Professor Massart has recently published this material, and it appears in English under the title "Belgians under the German Eagle." Professor Massart spent twelve months in Belgium after the invasion. His book constitutes a documented and terrible indictment. It is one of the books that should be tested by a neutral commission.

From this book I make the following extracts: —

A little further to the east the first German troops who had passed through Schaffen, near Diest, on the 13th or 14th August, had there tortured the blacksmith Broeden. All day long he had labored, shoeing the horses of the enemy's cavalry. Early in the evening he repaired to the church, with the sacristan, with the object of saving some precious articles which had not been placed in security. He was surprised by the soldiery and seized. Successively the Germans broke his wrists, his arms, and his legs; perhaps he suffered yet other tortures. When he was apparently lifeless the soldiers asked him whether he thought that he would in future be capable of undertaking any kind of labor. On his replying, in an almost inaudible tone, that he did not, they declared that in that case he ought not to continue to live. Immediately they threw him, head first, into a ditch dug for the purpose; then the ditch was filled, leaving his feet protruding.

Moral tortures before execution

To force those about to be shot to dig their own graves, as they did at Tavigny, is quite a commonplace method. In the Fonds de Leffe, on the 23d August, 1914, they perfected their mode of operation. They had called up eight men of Dinant to bury the victims as they were shot (there was so much work to do that it had to be entrusted to experienced hands). In the evening each of the gravediggers dug his own grave; four were shot, and buried by their colleagues; just as these were about to suffer the same fate an officer

"pardoned" them: not out of humanity (that would have been too decent), but simply because their services would be required during the following days.

The most important execution was that of 123 (others say 127) inhabitants of Rossignol and its immediate surroundings, who were shot on 26th August. They were taken near the viaduct which passes over the Arlon railway station (towards the connecting station). They were killed in small groups of ten or twelve. Those who were not dead were finished with the bayonet. Each group had to climb over the surrounding corpses. They kept to the last a lady of Rossignol, Madame Hurieaux, who thus had to see her husband, and the greater part of the inhabitants of her village killed before her eyes. She died crying, "Vive la Belgique! Vive la France!"

Extracts from a narrative by Father Gamarra, a South American priest, of the destruction of Louvain.

The inhabitants fled in terror through the flames and were shot in the street in the most pitiless manner. No consideration was shown either to the old or to the priests (who were objects of special hatred) or to women or children. Whole families perished from asphyxiation in the cellars of their own houses.

Father Gamarra reckons that no fewer than four hundred persons perished on that night, either shot or burnt alive or suffocated. The reverend priest will never forget the horrible scenes which he witnessed.

The torture of the inhabitants of Louvain continued on that day, the 26th, and 50,000 of them were obliged to leave the town. They were taken to Hanover and other German towns by hundreds in cattle trucks. In the German stations the populace clamored for the death of the prisoners. Regular caravans of women were driven towards Tirlemont on foot for some thirty kilometres, and some of these were pregnant. Other groups were kept prisoners in the fields and on the hills and were obliged to eat raw potatoes and roots.

OBSTACLES TO PEACE

The Helpless Victims

By Mrs. Nina Larrey Duryee

Hotel Windsor,
Dinard, France, September 1, 1914.

To the Editor of the New York Times: —

This is written in great haste to catch the rare boat to England. The author is an American woman, who has spent nine happy summers in this beautiful corner of France, where thousands of her compatriots have likewise enjoyed Brittany's kindly hospitality.

Yesterday I saw issuing through St. Malo's eleventh-century gates three hundred Belgians refugees, headed by our Dinard Mayor, M. Cralard. I try to write calmly of that procession of the half-starved, terror-ridden throng, but with the memory of those pinched faces and the stories we heard of murder, carnage, burning towns, insulted women, it is difficult to restrain indignation. They had come from Charleroi and Mons — old men, women, and little children. Not a man of strength or middle age among them, for they are dead or away fighting the barbarians who invested their little country against all honorable dealings.

Such a procession! They had slept in fields, eaten berries, carrots dug from the earth by their hands; drunk from muddy pools, always with those beings behind them who had driven them at the point of their bayonets from their poor homes. Looking back, they had seen flames against the sky, heard screams for pity from those too ill to leave, silenced by bullets.

Here are some of the tales, which our Mayor vouches for, which I heard: —

One young mother, who had seen her husband shot, tried to put aside the rifle of the assassin. She was holding her year-old baby on her breast. The butt of that rifle was beaten down, crushing in her baby's chest. It still lives, and I heard its gasping breath.

Another young girl in remnants of a pretty silk dress, hatless, her fragile shoes soleless, and her feet bleeding, is

quite mad from the horrors of seeing her old father shot and her two younger brothers taken away to go before the advancing enemy, as shields against English bullets. She has forgotten her name, town, and kin, and, "like a leaf in the storm," is adrift on the world penniless.

I saw sitting in a row on a bench in the shed seven little girls, none of them more than six. Not one of them has now father, mother, or home. None can tell whence they came, or to whom they belong. Three are plainly of gentle birth. They were with nurses when the horde of Prussians fell upon them, and the latter were kept — for the soldiers' pleasure.

There is an old man, formerly the proud proprietor of a bakery, who escaped with the tiny delivery cart pulled by a Belgian dog. Within the cart are the remains of his prosperous past — a coat, photos of his dead wife, and his three sons at the front, and a brass kettle.

I heard from an aged man how he escaped death. He, with other villagers, was locked into a room, and from without the German carbines were thrust through the blinds. Those within were told to "dance for their lives," and the German bullets picked them off, one by one, from the street. He had the presence of mind to fall as though dead, and when the house was set on fire crawled out through a window into the cowshed and got away.

Now, these stories are not the worst or the only ones. Nor are these three hundred refugees more than a drop of sand on a beach of the thousands upon thousands who are at this moment in like case. They are pouring through the country now, dazed with trouble, robbed of all they possess.

Who can help them, even to work? No one has money. Even those rich villa people, Americans, are unable to pay their servants. There is no "work" save in the fields garnering crops, for which no wages are paid. Their country is a devastated waste, tenanted by the enemy, who spread like a tidal wave of destruction in all directions. We take the better class into our homes, clothe them and feed them gladly, that we may in a minute way repay the debt civilization owes their husbands, sons, and fathers. France, too, is

invaded, and now thousands more of French are homeless and penniless.

We in this formerly gay, fashionable little town see nothing of the pageantry of war — only its horrors, as trains leave with us hundreds of wounded from the front. In their bodies we find dumdum bullets, and we hear tales which confirm those of the refugees.

Will America help them? I, an American woman, could weep for the inadequacy of my pen, for I beg your pity, your compassion, and your help. Not since the days of Rome's cruelty has civilization been so outraged.

I beg your paper to print this, and to start a subscription for this far corner of France, where the tide of war throws its wreckage. The winter is ahead, and with hunger, cold, lack of supplies, and isolation will create untold suffering. Paris, too, is now sending refugees from its besieged gates. Every corner is already filled, and hundreds pour in every day. The garages, best hotels, villas, and cafés are already filled with "those that suffer for honor's sake." The Croix Rouge does splendid work for the wounded soldiers, but who will help these victims of war? Fifty cents will buy shoes for a baby's feet. Ten cents will buy ten pieces of bread. A dollar will buy a widow a shawl. Who will give? Deny yourselves some little pleasure — a cigar, a drink of soda water, a theater seat — and send the price to these starved, beaten people, innocent of any crime.

You American women, who tuck your children into their clean beds at night, remember these children, reared as carefully as yours, without relatives, money, or future. They will be placed on farms to do a peasant's work with peasants. These women bereft of all that was dear face a barren future. These aged men anticipate for their only remaining blessing death, which will take them from a world which has used them ill.

America is neutral. Let her remain so, but compassion has no nationality. We are all children of one Father. Send us help. These poor creatures hold out to you pleading hands for succor.

II. Germany's Defense

I print herewith denials from high sources in Germany of the charges made as to Belgian atrocities. These statements express the universal belief in Germany.

A writer in the "Nineteenth Century" says: —

> And quite apart from the question whether these stories are true, they constitute still to-day, as a matter of undeniable psychological fact, the most tremendous barrier between the two peoples — a barrier of moral disgust on the one side and indignant denial on the other. We English should do well to remember one thing. The indignant denial, wherever it is sincere, — and it is unquestionably sincere in large circles of educated German opinion, — proves this much, that those circles are not divided from us by a difference of moral code.

As far as I know, no Germans believe that their soldiers, except possibly in isolated cases, transgressed the rules of war, and all Germans believe that the people of Belgium grossly violated the Hague Conventions.

Statement as to Louvain by Dr. Zimmermann, until recently Permanent Under-Secretary of State, and now Germany's Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The City of Louvain had been handed over by the authorities, and on Monday, 24th August, we began to disentrain troops. Billeting and intercourse with the inhabitants were proceeding in a friendly way. On Tuesday, 25th August, in the afternoon, troops left in the direction of Antwerp on the receipt of news that an attack was impending. The General Commanding left in a motor-car at their head, and in Louvain there only remained troops to guard the station, supply columns and the territorial battalion of the guard "Neuss." When the Second Mounted Division

was preparing to follow the Commanding Officer, and was beginning to form in the market-place, it was received with revolver shots from the inside of the neighboring houses.

All the horses were killed and five officers were wounded, one of them seriously. At the same time fire was opened in ten other distinct parts of the city and also on the troops which at that moment were arriving by train and were preparing to detrain. All this was systematically done and carried out as part of the plan of the attack which was expected from the side of Antwerp.

Two clergymen were found handing out cartridges, and these were immediately shot in the station square. The fighting in the streets lasted till the afternoon of Wednesday, 26th August, and was only put down when a superior number of troops arrived. The town and the northern suburbs were in flames in various places, and probably have now been reduced to ashes. The Belgian Government had, sometime before, organized a general levée against the enemy when they crossed the frontier, and for this purpose magazines of arms were established and every rifle bore the name of the citizen who was to use it.

Spontaneous levées of a nation were recognized by the Hague Conference at the request of small States, so long as arms are carried, and the laws of war observed, but they are only admissible in order to fight against an approaching enemy. In the case of Louvain, the town had capitulated and the population had, therefore, renounced all resistance and the place was already occupied by our troops.

In spite of this, the population attacked the troops of occupation and those that were arriving by train and in motor-cars, trusting to the peaceful behavior which had been shown hitherto, and met them with a deadly fire. It was, therefore, a question not of legitimate defense or of war tactics, but of a cowardly attack on the part of civilians; an attack which was all the more to be condemned, since it had been clearly thought out beforehand in conjunction with a plan of a sortie from Antwerp. The inhabitants did not carry arms openly. Women and girls took part in the fight and gouged out the eyes of the wounded.

The barbarous behavior of the Belgian populace in nearly all the districts occupied by us, not only gave us the right, but forced us, in our own defense, to have recourse to most severe measures. The intensity of the fight is indicated by the fact that more than twenty-four hours were needed to suppress the attack. That the town of Louvain has, to a great extent, been destroyed is a matter of deep concern to us, but we had no intention to bring this about, and it could not be avoided in chastising the infamous attack made against our troops by a shameful guerrilla warfare.

He who knows the kindness of our troops will not be able conscientiously to state that they are inclined to wanton and useless destruction.

The responsibility for lawless and unjust procedure falls upon the Belgian Government, who, by arbitrarily infringing the law of nations, induced the people to act criminally in spite of repeated warnings given after the fall of Liège to prevent a repetition of these cowardly attacks and in spite of invitations to the people to observe a peaceful attitude.

(Signed) ZIMMERMANN.

An appeal to the civilized world

By ninety-three professors of Germany

As representatives of German science and art, we hereby protest to the civilized world against the lies and calumnies with which our enemies are endeavoring to stain the honor of Germany in her hard struggle for existence — in a struggle which has been forced upon her.

The iron mouth of events has proved the untruth of the fictitious German defeats, consequently misrepresentation and calumny are all the more eagerly at work. As heralds of truth we raise our voices against these.

It is not true that the life and property of a single Belgian citizen was injured by our soldiers without the bitterest self-defense having made it necessary; for again and again, notwithstanding repeated threats, the citizens lay in ambush, shooting at the troops out of the houses, mutilating the

wounded, and murdering in cold blood the medical men while they were doing their Samaritan work. There can be no baser abuse than the suppression of these crimes with the view of letting the Germans appear to be criminals, only for having justly punished these assassins for their wicked deeds.

It is not true that our troops treated Louvain brutally. Furious inhabitants having treacherously fallen upon them in their quarters, our troops with aching hearts were obliged to fire a part of the town as a punishment. The greatest part of Louvain has been preserved. The famous Town Hall stands quite intact; for at great self-sacrifice our soldiers saved it from destruction by the flames. Every German would of course greatly regret if in the course of this terrible war any works of art should already have been destroyed or be destroyed at some future time, but inasmuch as in our great love for art we cannot be surpassed by any other nation, in the same degree we must decidedly refuse to buy a German defeat at the cost of saving a work of art.

It is not true that our warfare pays no respect to international laws. It knows no undisciplined cruelty. But in the east the earth is saturated with the blood of women and children unmercifully butchered by the wild Russian troops, and in the west dum-dum bullets mutilate the breasts of our soldiers. Those who have allied themselves with Russians and Servians, and present such a shameful scene to the world as that of inciting Mongolians and Negroes against the white race, have no right whatever to call themselves upholders of civilization.

It is not true that the combat against our so-called militarism is not a combat against our civilization, as our enemies hypocritically pretend it is. Were it not for German militarism, German civilization would long since have been extirpated. For its protection it arose in a land which for centuries had been plagued by bands of robbers as no other land had been. The German army and the German people are one, and to-day this consciousness fraternizes seventy millions of Germans, all ranks, positions, and parties being one.

We cannot wrest the poisonous weapon — the lie — out of the hands of our enemies. All we can do is to proclaim to all the world that our enemies are giving false witness against us. You, who know us, who with us have protected the most holy possessions of man, we call to you:

Have faith in us! Believe that we shall carry on this war to the end as a civilized nation, to whom the legacy of a Goethe, a Beethoven, and a Kant is just as sacred as its own hearths and homes.

For this we pledge you our names and our honor.

This document bears the signatures, alphabetically arranged, of ninety-three Germans, among whom are to be found the following: The historians Lamprecht and Harnack: the jurists Laband, Liszt, and Von Mayr; the philosophers Eucken, Riehl, Windelband, and Wundt; the physician Roentgen; the chemists Ehrlich, Fischer, and Ostwald; the zoölogist Haeckel; the astronomer W. Foester; the economists Brentano and Schmoller; the philologist Willamowitz-Moellendorf; the publicist Naumann; the art historian W. Bode; the painters Kaulbach, Klinger, Liebermann, Stuck, and Trübner; the writers L. Fulda, G. Hauptmann, R. Dehmel, Halbe, and Sudermann; the musicians Humperdinck, Siegfried Wagner, and Felix Weingartner; finally, the president of the Reichstag, Arthur Kampf, and the theatrical director, Max Reinhardt.

CHAPTER XII

ALLEGED ATROCITIES ON THE GERMAN TROOPS BY CIVILIANS IN BELGIUM

I. The German Allegations

When, last January, I visited the family of Professor Rudolph Eucken in Jena, his daughter told me of the terrible atrocities perpetrated by the Belgians, including women and girls, on the wounded German soldiers. She expressed the universal belief in Germany. Afterwards I got a copy of the Official German White Book, entitled in English "The Belgian People's War, A Violation of International Law." This book contains 135 pages. It deals fully with Aerschot, Andenne, Dinant, Louvain, and other places.

I publish herewith extracts from the German White Book: —

The Belgian People's War

Memorial

Immediately after the outbreak of the war in Belgium a savage fight was started by the Belgian civilians against the German troops, a fight which was a flagrant violation of international law and had the gravest consequences for Belgium and her people.

That fight of a population which was governed by savage passion raged throughout Belgium during the whole advance of the German army. . . .

According to this evidence the Belgian civilian population has fought against the German troops at many places in the provinces of Liège, Luxemburg, Namur, Hainault, Brabant,

East and West Flanders. The fights at Aerschot, Andenne, Dinant, and Louvain assumed a particularly terrible character. About these, special reports have been drawn up by the Military Bureau for the Investigation of Offenses against the Laws of War established in the army department. In these fights men of the most varied classes, workmen, manufacturers, doctors, teachers, even clergymen, nay, women and children, were caught with arms in hand. In districts from which the regular Belgian troops had long withdrawn, shots were fired on the German troops from houses and gardens, roofs and cellars, fields and woods. In those fights means were used which no regular troops would have employed. Thus, large quantities of sporting rifles and ammunition, obsolete pistols and revolvers were found, and numerous in consequence were the wounds by small shot, and also by burning with hot tar and boiling water. From all this it is evident that the war of the people in Belgium was not only waged by individual civilians, but by large masses of the population.

But what the Belgian civilians are especially to be charged with is the unheard-of violation of the customs of war. In different places, e.g., near Liège, Hervé, and Brussels, in Aerschot, Dinant, and Louvain, German soldiers have been foully assassinated; although Article 23, section 1b, of the Hague Regulations of Warfare on Land, forbids to "kill or wound treacherously individuals belonging to the hostile nation or army." Moreover, the Belgian population has disregarded the sign of the Red Cross, and thus offended against Article 9 of the Geneva Convention of July 6, 1906. Thus, Belgian civilians did not shrink from shooting under cover of this sign at the German troops and from attacking hospitals with wounded soldiers and the sanitary staff while in the execution of their duty. Finally, it has been established beyond doubt that Belgian civilians plundered, killed, and even shockingly mutilated German wounded soldiers, in which atrocities even women and children took part. Thus, the eyes were gouged out of the German wounded soldiers, their ears, noses, finger-joints were cut off, or they were emasculated or disemboweled. In other cases, German

soldiers were poisoned or strung up on trees; hot liquid was poured over them, or they were otherwise burned so that they died under terrible tortures. All these bestialities of the Belgian population are an outrage, not only to the express obligation "to respect and care" for the sick and wounded of the enemy (Article 1, Section 1, of the Geneva Convention), but also to the primary principles of the laws of war and humanity. . . .

Old men, women, and children, even when under grave suspicion, were spared to the largest possible degree; more than that: the German soldiers, although their patience was put to a most severe test by the treacherous attacks, often cared for such persons in a manner which can only be termed as self-sacrificing, taking helpless persons who were in peril under their protection, sharing their bread with them or giving the weak and sick in charge.

The Belgian Government has tried to evade this responsibility by putting the blame for the things that happened on the German troops whose lust of destruction is said to have made them commit violence without any provocation. The Belgian Government has appointed a commission for the investigation of the atrocities alleged to have been committed by the German troops and it has made the findings of this commission a matter of diplomatic protests. This attempt to pervert the facts into their reverse has failed entirely. The German army is accustomed to warfare only against hostile armies but not against peaceful inhabitants. That from the beginning of their entry into Belgium the German troops were forced by the native population into a defensive fight in the interest of self-preservation, this irrefutable fact cannot be put out of the world by any investigation of whatever commission.

The tales of refugees compiled by the Belgian Commission, which are represented as the result of strictly impartial investigations, bear the stamp of untrustworthiness, if not of malicious distortion, on their face. Considering the circumstances, the Commission cannot possibly test the correctness of rumors reported to them, or see the interrelation of the various happenings. Hence their accusations of the German

army are nothing else but base defamations which are easily disproved by the documentary evidence appended.

Military Court Examination of Reservists Gustav Voigt, Fritz Marks and Henry Hartmann, of Infantry Regiment No. 165

(1) Reservist Gustav Voigt: —

My name is Gustav Voigt; my age twenty-four. I am a Lutheran and a Reservist of Company 6 of Infantry Regiment No. 165.

In the morning of August 7, I and seven other comrades became detached from our troop. We had to sneak through the gardens of a village closely beyond Hervé in Belgium to look for cover. Suddenly we saw how five Belgian soldiers threw up their hands and wished to surrender. They hailed us and we approached them and noticed that they had two Germans with them (of the Tenth Hussars) bound with ropes. One of the latter drew our attention to a third Hussar hanging up in a tree, dead. We saw that his ears and nose were cut off. The Hussars also told us that the five Belgians had just been getting ready to kill or mutilate them, if we had not come up. We disarmed the Belgians, took them prisoners, and delivered them to a troop of the Fifth Uhlans who had already several captured Belgians with them. We joined the Uhlans to get back to our company, and, while passing through the village, were fired at from cellars and windows. I do not know the name of the village, but it is situated between Hervé and a big coal mine in the direction towards Liège. I myself was wounded in the street fighting at Liège.

On the day previous to that incident our company was engaged in a skirmish of outposts to the right of Hervé; at that time a one-year private of Company 5 of Infantry Regiment No. 165 was wounded and left where he fell. When we passed the spot the next morning we found body of that private at a garden fence; both his eyes had been gouged out. Every one of us was convinced that villagers had done this.

On or about August 7, when we marched on Liège we saw

a German infantryman — I think of Regiment No. 27; he showed no shot wound, but was dead, having been completely emasculated.

Read, approved, signed.

(Signed) GUSTAV VOIGT.

(2) Reservist Fritz Marks: —

My name is Fritz Marks; my age twenty-three, I am a Protestant, by trade a factory-hand; and a Reservist of Company 2 of Infantry Regiment No. 165.

On August 25 our battalion marched through a village near Hervé in Belgium. A man of the 5th company met us and exclaimed: "Such a dirty trick, now they have gouged out the eyes of one of our men." He pointed out where the man lay. We all had to pass the spot and there saw the dead man lie by the fence with both eyes gouged out. We were certain that villagers had done this. When on the next day we again passed through the village we were shot at from cellars and windows, and orders were given to disarm and arrest the villagers. We entered the houses and executed the order. But when the shooting continued all the same, six guilty Belgian peasants were executed by order of an officer.

Read, approved, signed.

(Signed) FRITZ MARKS.

(3) Reservist Heinrich Hartmann: —

My name is Friedrich Heinrich Hartmann; my age twenty-four. I am a Protestant; Reservist of Company 2 of Infantry Regiment No. 165.

I, too, saw the private of Company 5 with his eyes gouged out. The officer in charge of our company, Captain Burkholz, ordered us to search the houses of the village. In the house by the fence of which the body of the private had been found, we discovered a big strong middle-aged man who lay in bed and feigned sleep. We arrested him and led him before the officers who examined the man. He was then upon order shot by a musketeer of Company 4.

While we marched on Liège we passed a German infantryman who had been submerged, head down, in a bog and was dead.

Read, approved, signed.

(Signed) Heinrich Hartmann.

Court Examination of Musketeer Paul Blankenburg of Infantry Regiment No. 165

Paul Blankenburg, musketeer of Company 7 of Infantry Regiment No. 165, at present under treatment at the reserve hospital of this city, appeared and, having been instructed as to the meaning of the oath, deposed as follows: —

My name is Paul Blankenburg. I am a native of Magdeburg, twenty-one years old; a Lutheran.

The following statement is read to witness which he made in the presence of Lieutenant Reyner on October 31: —

> Marching in closed column we passed through a Belgian village situated west of Hervé. There were German wounded lying about in the village, amongst whom I recognized men of the 4th Battalion of Chasseurs. Suddenly our marching columns were fired at from the houses, and orders were given, therefore, to remove all civilians from these houses and gather them in one place. While this was being done I noticed that girls, about eight or ten years old, armed with a sharp instrument, busied themselves with the German wounded. Later I ascertained that the ear lobes and upper part of the ears of those of the wounded who were gravely injured had been cut off. As we proceeded an orderly of the sanitary corps — if I remember right of the 27th Regiment — was shot to death by Belgian civilians firing from the schoolhouse while he was engaged in aiding a wounded soldier in the school yard.

Witness thereupon declared: —

The statement just read to me is true and correct. I emphasize once more that I myself saw how girls aged

eight or ten busied themselves with the severely wounded in the Belgian village. The girls had steel instruments in their hands — but these were not knives or scissors — and with these instruments, which had a sharp edge on one side, and which we took from them, they busied themselves with the wounded. There were fresh wounds on the ears of the wounded soldiers, their ear-lobes and upper parts of the ears having been cut off evidently only just before we came.

One of the wounded, in reply to my questions, told me that he had been mutilated in the above-described manner by the girls.

Read, approved, signed.

(Signed) PAUL BLANKENBURG.

Military Court Examination of Sergeant Major Weinrich of Infantry Regiment No. 20

Sergeant Major Weinrich of the Machine Gun Company of Infantry Regiment No. 20 appeared, and, after being instructed about the meaning of the oath, declared the following: —

My name is Adolf Weinrich. I am thirty-two years of age; a Protestant.

On a day during the middle of August of this year, while the company was engaged in fighting the enemy, I was following in the rear with the wagons. At the entrance of Neer-Linter, I saw a German Hussar lying near a house; he was covered with a bag. I alighted from my horse, raised the bag, and observed that the Hussar was dead. His face was covered with blood, and his eyes had been pierced; both eye apples had been completely cut out and could not be found near by. His uniform was torn open, the chest was bare, and showed about twenty stabs. His hands were tied together on his back. I then covered the corpse again with the bag.

Read, approved, signed.

(Signed) ADOLF WEINRICH.

What German children are taught regarding the invasion of Belgium

The "Times Current History" for November, 1916, publishes some extracts from a German book for boys by Ernst Niederhausen, entitled "Welt Krieg": —

Ceaselessly marched the masses of the German army entering Belgium, regiment upon regiment. For these potent masses of troops were followed by supporting troops. . . . If troops left their posts, others instantly took their places. The land of Germany seemed to the Belgians to be inexhaustible in defenders.

At the sight of these beneficent forces, the hate of the malignant Belgians grew. In the shadows of the night, sinister ambushes were prepared. Hidden behind trees, or in the ditches, the Belgians fired on German troops. They even slew the weary soldiers who sought rest in the huts of the peasants, while these soldiers slept. Brigandage was rife. Often, the leading people of the country organized and directed these ambuscades. It was not at all a question of single acts, committed under the impulse of anger, but rather the execution of a plan carefully prepared beforehand. Breaches were made in roofs, openings made in walls, loopholes were contrived for the treacherous muzzles of rifles; houses were joined by tunnels, so that their defenders could flee from one to the other. Savage fusillades were fired in the darkness. Houses had to be taken one by one. The German wounded were frightfully mutilated and put to death: Every feeling of humanity seemed to have deserted the miserable Belgian people (*alles Menschentum schien von diesem elenden Belgischen Volke gewichen zu sein*). . . .

On August 25, the German troops entering Louvain were received in the friendliest possible way by the inhabitants. The townsfolk vied with one another in lodging the officers in the most comfortable manner possible.

The evening descended. Nine o'clock sounded from the city belfries. As by a single stroke, the windows opened. The flashes of a fusillade blazed forth.

All the townsfolk, favored by the shades of night, began a combat prepared in advance, following a plan (*einen planmaessig vorbereiteten Kampf*), against what was left of the German garrison.

It was now clearly to be seen why they had wished to isolate the officers, by finding separate lodgings for them.

Daggers and pistols were ready, to rob the troops of their leaders. But matters fell out far otherwise. . . .

The abominable plan had failed. The City of Louvain was burning. All the streets that the dogs of Belgians (*canaille*) lived in were in flames. Whoever was taken with arms in his hands was shot.

The sky was red as blood; Heaven announced to the world how the brave German soldiers, who were fighting in a hostile land for their country, suddenly attacked, met the impotent race of cowardly assassins and defended themselves in a struggle by night against the savage onslaught of murderers. . . .

Everywhere in Germany I found that the people, from the most highly placed to those in the common walks of life, believed absolutely this report of the Government, and utterly disbelieved the various reports as to atrocities by the German soldiers on the Belgian civilians.

The "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" publishes (September 19, 1914), the following telegram addressed by the Emperor to President Wilson of the United States: —

The Belgian Government has openly encouraged the civil population to take part in this war, which it had carefully for a long time prepared. The cruelties inflicted, in the course of this guerrilla war, by women and even by priests, upon wounded soldiers, doctors, and hospital nurses (doctors have been killed and hospitals fired on) have been such that my generals have finally found themselves obliged to resort to the most rigorous means to chastise the guilty and to

prevent the bloodthirsty population from continuing these abominable, criminal, and hateful acts. Many villages, and even the city of Louvain, have had to be demolished (except the very beautiful Hôtel de Ville) in the interest of our defense and the protection of our troops. My heart bleeds when I see that such measures have been rendered inevitable, and when I think of the innumerable innocent persons who have lost their homes and their belongings as a result of the deeds of the criminals in question.

WILHELM I.R.

The German Military Government.[1]

II. BELGIUM'S DEFENSE

The extracts I print herewith from the letters of the Bishops of Belgium to the Bishops of Germany, Bavaria and Austria-Hungary are difficult to read unmoved.

It is a very pathetic and heart-breaking appeal to Germany. If there is any sense of mercy and pity and justice left in the people of the neutral countries, they will surely demand that a neutral investigation be made by a tribunal so competent and so worthy of confidence that the truth may be established in the sight of all men. *The Catholic Church is on trial, as never before in its history.* If the Catholic Church withholds itself and closes its ears to the most pathetic and moving plea ever made, and made by one great body of Catholic Bishops to another great body of Catholic Bishops, then it will lose the respect of all mankind. If the United States closes its ear to this pitiful and heart-breaking plea, then we will be worthy of any punishment that may be inflicted on a people who have forgotten God.

It is of fundamental importance above all for the

[1] Extract.

German people to have a neutral commission study all the facts about Belgium. Either they must be convinced of the truth of the charges and repudiate the policy of their military leaders, or the German nation must be exonerated if the charges are baseless. The neutral world is largely convinced of the truth of the statements made by the Belgian Bishops.

Here is a report of the work of the Pax Society:—

When the alleged atrocities by Belgian civilians, including boys and girls of tender age, were reported in the German press, a society of priests (*Pax Gesellschaft*) in Cologne made it its business to follow them up by inquiring at the next Divisional Headquarters or even at the Berlin War Office for confirmation. It would seem that they were able to obtain an official denial in every single case which came under their notice. During the present year the Pax Society placed their documentary evidence at the disposal of the Reverend Bernhard Duhr, S.J., who edited and published a considerable section under the title, "The Spirit of Lying in the War of Nations: War Legends collected by Bernhard Duhr, S.J." Herr Duhr states emphatically that there was not a single instance of gouged-out eyes. His proofs include the denials of the story by directors of military hospitals in all parts of Germany. The book is interesting as a psychological study of the effects of war upon the popular imagination, but it may further possess historical value. The documents collected by the priests all bear an official character and seem to contradict the charges in the Government's White Book.

In February, 1915, "Vorwärts" protested against a little work by a Pastor Conrad, of which one hundred and fifty thousand copies were printed and sold at eight pfennigs per copy to school-children, in which the Belgians were still accused of having blinded their prisoners.

The Belgian Freemasons ask the German Freemasons to investigate[1]

Painfully moved by the horrors committed in Belgium, M. Charles Magnet, the National Grand Master of Belgian Freemasonry, wrote on the 9th September to nine German lodges, requesting them to institute, by common consent, an inquiry into the facts. Since the Germans denied the atrocities of which their troops were accused, and, on the other hand, were accusing the Belgians of maltreating the wounded, such an inquiry could only have a happy result. Two lodges only replied. "The request is superfluous; this inquiry would be an insult to our army," replied the Darmstadt lodge. "Our troops are not ill-conducted; it would even be dangerous to recommend them to display sensibility and kindness," replied the Bayreuth lodge.

On the 24th January, 1915, Cardinal Mercier requested the German authorities in Belgium to set up a commission comprising both Germans and Belgians, under the presidency of a representative of a neutral country. His request was accorded no reply.

Thus, the Germans refuse to allow any light to be thrown on their actions and those of the Belgians. Why this opposition to a faithful search for the truth? They fear, perhaps, that the truth will be unfavorable to them. That is undoubtedly one of their reasons; but we do not think it can be the only reason; and the principal reason for their refusal is without doubt the voluntary blindness to which they have one and all subjected themselves since the outbreak of the war.

They have decided, one would imagine, to accept, without any discussion, whatever is decreed by authority, which they invest with the absolute truth; every German calmly receives that portion of the truth which the Government thinks fit to dispense to its faithful, and no German permits himself to ask for more. *Magister dixit:* the Staff has spoken!

[1] From *Belgians under the German Eagle,* by Jean Massart.

Letters of the Bishops of Belgium to the Bishops of Germany, Bavaria, and Austria-Hungary.

November the 24th, 1915.

To Their Eminences the Cardinals and Their Lordships the Bishops of Germany, Bavaria, and Austria-Hungary:—

As Catholic Bishops, you, the Bishops of Germany on the one hand, and we, the Bishops of Belgium, France, and England on the other, have been giving for a year an unsettling example to the world.

Scarcely had the German armies trodden the soil of our country than the rumor was spread among you that our civil population was taking part in military operations; that the women of Visé and Liège were putting out your soldiers' eyes; that the populace in Antwerp and Brussels had sacked the property of expelled Germans.

First German accusations

In the first days of August (1914) Dom Ildefonds Herwegen, Abbot of Maria Laach, sent to the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines a telegram in which he begged him, for the love of God, to protect German soldiers against the tortures which our countrymen were supposed to be inflicting on them.

Now, it was notorious that our Government had taken useful measures so that every citizen might be instructed in the laws of war; in each commune, the arms of the inhabitants had to be deposited in the communal house; by posters, the population was warned that only citizens regularly enrolled under the flag were authorized to bear arms; and the clergy, anxious to aid the State in its mission, had spread, by word of mouth, by parish bulletins, by posters on church doors, the instructions given by its Government.

We were accustomed for a century to the rule of peace and we had no idea that any one, in good faith, could attribute to us violent instincts. We were strong in our right and in the sincerity of our peaceful intentions; and we

answered calumnies about "free shooters" and "eyes put out," with a shrug of the shoulders, since we were persuaded that the truth would be known, without delay, of itself.

From the very first days of August crimes had been committed, at Battice, Visé, Berneau, Hervé, and elsewhere, but we were hoping that they would remain isolated deeds, and, knowing the very high relations which Dom Ildefonds had, we put great confidence in the following declaration which he sent us on the 11th of August: —

> I am informed, at first hand, that formal orders have been given to German soldiers by the military authorities to spare the innocent. As to the very deplorable fact that even priests have lost their lives, I allow myself to bring to Your Eminence's attention that, within these last days, the dress of priests and monks has become the object of suspicions and scandal, since French spies have used the ecclesiastical costume, and even that of religious communities, to disguise their hostile intentions.

Meanwhile, the acts of hostility toward innocent populations went on.

First protestations of the Bishops of Liège and Namur

On the 18th of August, 1914, the Bishop of Liège wrote to the Commanding Officer, Major Bayer, Governor of the city of Liège: —

> One after the other, several villages have been destroyed; notable persons, among whom were parish priests, have been shot; others have been arrested, and all have protested their innocence. I know the priests of my diocese; I cannot believe that a single one of them would have made himself guilty of acts of hostility toward the German soldiers. I have visited several ambulances, and I have seen German soldiers cared for in them with the same zeal as Belgians. This they themselves acknowledge.

This letter remained unanswered.

In the beginning of September, the Emperor of Germany

covered with his authority the calumnious accusations of which our innocent populations were the object. He sent to Mr. Wilson, President of the United States, this telegram, which, so far as we know, has not hitherto been retracted: —

> The Belgian Government has publicly encouraged the civil population to take part in this war, which it had been preparing carefully for a long time. The cruelties committed during the course of this guerrilla war, by women and even by priests, on doctors and nurses have been such that my generals have finally been obliged to have recourse to the most rigorous methods to chastise the guilty and to prevent the sanguinary population continuing its abominable criminal and odious deeds. Several villages and even the city of Louvain have had to be demolished (excepting the very beautiful Hôtel-de-Ville) in the interest of our defense, and for the protection of my troops. My heart bleeds when I see that such measures have been made inevitable and when I think of the numberless innocent people who have lost home and goods as a consequence of those criminal deeds.

The very next day, 12th of September, the Bishop of Namur demanded to be received by the Military Governor of Namur, and protested against the reputation which His Majesty the Emperor sought to give to the Belgian clergy; he affirmed the innocence of all the members of the clergy who had been shot or maltreated, and declared that he was ready himself to publish any culpable deeds which might be proved.

The offer of the Bishop of Namur was not accepted, and no answer was made to his protest.

Falsehoods of the Imperial Government

Thus calumny was able to pursue its course freely. The German press encouraged it.

Not one voice was lifted up in Germany to take the defense of the victims.

We know that these shameless accusations of the Imperial Government are, from one end to the other, calumnies — we know it and we swear it.

Belgian Bishops demand an investigation

Very well, Most Reverend Eminences, Venerated Colleagues of the German Episcopate, in our turn, we Archbishops and Bishops of Belgium — revolting at the calumnies against our Belgian country and its glorious army, which are contained in the White Book of the Empire and reproduced in the German Catholics' answer to the work published by French Catholics — we feel the need of expressing to our King, to our Government, to our army, to our country, our sorrowful indignation.

And that our protest may not run counter to yours, without useful effect, we ask you to be willing to aid us to institute a tribunal of inquiry with evidence and counter-evidence. In the name of your officiality, you will appoint as many members as you desire, and as it pleases you to choose; we will appoint as many more, three for example, on each side. And we will ask together that the episcopate of a neutral State — Holland, Spain, Switzerland, or the United States — appoint for us a "superarbiter," who will preside at the operations of the tribunal.

You have taken your complaints to the Sovereign Head of the Church.

It is not just that he should hear only your voice.

You will have the loyalty to aid us to make our voice heard also.

We have — you and we — an identical duty, to put before His Holiness tried documents on which he may be able to base his judgment.

The German Government has always refused a serious investigation

You are not ignorant of the efforts we have made, one after another, to obtain from the Power which occupies Belgium the constitution of a tribunal of investigation.

The Cardinal of Malines, on two occasions, in writing, — January 24, 1915, and February 10, 1915, — and the Bishop of Namur, by a letter addressed to the Military Governor of his province, April 12, 1915, both solicited the formation of a tribunal to be composed of German and Belgian arbiters in equal number and to be presided over by a delegate from a neutral State.

Our efforts met with an obstinate refusal.

Yet the German authority was desirous to institute investigations. But it wished them to be one-sided — that is, without any judicial value.

After it had refused the investigation demanded by the Cardinal of Malines, the German authorities went into different localities where priests had been shot and peaceful citizens massacred or made prisoners, and there — on the depositions of a few witnesses taken haphazard or selected discreetly, sometimes in presence of a local authority who was ignorant of the German language and thus found himself forced to accept and sign blindly the minutes made — it believed itself authorized to come to conclusions which were afterwards to be presented to the public as results of cross-examination.

The German investigation was carried out, in November, 1914, at Louvain, in such conditions. It is therefore devoid of any authority.

So it is natural that we should turn to you.

The Bishops solemnly affirm the innocence of the Belgian people and the cruelty of Germany

We demand this investigation, Eminences and Venerated Colleagues, before all else to avenge the honor of the Belgian people. Calumnies put forth by your people and its highest representatives have violated it. And you know as well as we the adage of human, Christian, Catholic moral theology: "Without restitution, no pardon" — *Non remittitur pectatum, nisi restituatur ablatum.*

Your people, by the organ of its political powers and of its highest moral authorities, has accused our fellow-citizens of

giving themselves up to atrocities and horrors on wounded German soldiers, and particulars are given, as above cited, by the White Book and the German Catholics' Manifesto. To all such accusations we oppose a formal denial — and we demand to give the proofs of the truth of our denial.

On the other hand, to justify the atrocities committed in Belgium by the German army, the political power assert that the German army found itself in Belgium in the case of legitimate defense against a treacherous organization of free-shooters.

We affirm that there was nowhere in Belgium any organization of free-shooters — and we demand, in the name of our national honor, which has been calumniated, the right to give proofs of the truth of our affirmation.

You will call whom you choose before the tribunal of cross-investigation. We shall invite to appear there all the priests of parishes where civilians, priests, members of religious communities, or laymen were massacred or threatened with death to the cry — *Man hat geschossen* [Some one has been shooting] — we shall ask all these priests to sign, if you wish it, their testimony under oath and then — under penalty of pretending that the whole Belgian clergy is perjured, you will have to accept and the civilized world will not be able to refuse the conclusions of this solemn and decisive investigation.

Relying on our direct experience, we know — and we affirm — that the German army gave itself up in Belgium, in a hundred different places, to pillage and incendiarism, to imprisoning and massacres and sacrileges contrary to all justice and to all sentiment of humanity.

Fifty innocent priests, thousands of innocent faithful, were put to death; hundreds of others, whose lives have been preserved by circumstances independent of their persecutors' will, were put in danger of death; thousands of innocent people were made prisoners without trial, many of them underwent months of detention, and, when they were released, the most minute questionings to which they had been subjected had brought out against them no evidence of guilt.

These crimes cry to Heaven for vengeance.

If, when we formulate these denunciations we calumniate the German army; or if the military authority had just reasons to order or permit these acts, which we call criminal, it belongs to the honor and to the national interest of Germany to confound us. Just so long as German justice tries to escape, we keep the right and the duty to denounce what, in conscience, we consider a grave violation of justice and of our honor.

No escape is possible

And, forced by evidence, we answer you — it can be so, because it is so.

In face of the fact, no presumption holds.

For you, as for us, there is but one issue — the verification of the fact by a commission whose impartiality is and appears to all to be beyond dispute.

We have no difficulty in understanding your state of mind.

We, too, respect, believe us, the spirit of discipline and labor and faith of which we have so often had proofs and gathered testimony among your fellow-countrymen. Very numerous are those Belgians now who bitterly confess their deception. But they have lived through the sinister events of August and September. The truth has triumphed over all interior resistance. The fact can no longer be denied — Belgium has been made a martyr.

You will say, perhaps: "That is the past; forget it. Instead of casting oil on the fire, try rather to pardon and join your efforts with those of the Power occupying your territory — for it only asks to heal the wounds of the unhappy Belgian people."

Can Belgium be asked to resign herself and forget?

Germany will not give us back the blood she has made to flow and the innocent lives her armies have mowed down — but it is in her power to make restitution to the Belgian people of their honor, which she has violated or let be violated.

This restitution we demand from you — from you who are the first and chief representatives of Christian morals in the Church of Germany.

There is but one way to put a stop to these scandals, which is the bringing to the light of day the full truth, and the public condemnation, by the religious authority, of the truly guilty ones.

But there is a question which dominates all that — a question of morals, of right, and of honor.

"Seek ye therefore first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Do your duty, no matter what may be the result.

Therefore, we bishops, at the present hour, have a moral and, consequently, a religious duty which takes precedence of all others — to seek and to proclaim the truth.

Christ, of whom it is our great honor to be at once the disciples and the ministers, has said — has He not? — that His social mission is to bear witness to the truth: "For this was I born, for this came I into the world; that I should give testimony to the truth."

In the solemn days of our consecration as bishops, we promised God and the Catholic Church never to be deserters of the truth, not to give it up for ambition or fear when there should be question of proving that we love the truth.

Signed: D. J. Cardinal Mercier, *Archbishop of Malines.*
Anthony, *Bishop of Ghent.*
Gustave J., *Bishop of Bruges.*
Thomas Louis, *Bishop of Namur.*
Martin Hubert, *Bishop of Liège.*
Amédée Crooy, *appointed Bishop of Tournai.*

Poor little Belgium! What has she done to the rich and powerful Germany, her neighbor, to be thus trodden down, tortured, calumniated, bled, oppressed by her?

CHAPTER XIII

EXTRACTS FROM THE HAGUE CONVENTIONS OF 1907

BARON BEYENS, in his book "Germany Before the War," says: —

It was not unknown abroad, however, at any rate among jurists familiar with the work of the Hague Conferences, that there existed in Germany a "Code for war on land" (*Kriegsgebrauch im Landeskriege*), published in Berlin by the General Staff in 1902. The handbook, it was realized, had been written in quite a different spirit from that which animated the labors of the two conferences. This special war code for the use of German officers openly condemned all humanitarian ideas, all tender regard for persons or property, as incompatible with the nature and object of war; it authorized every means of attaining that object, and it left the choice and practice of those means to the entire discretion of the corps commanders. Still, however uneasy the exponents of international law may have felt as to the spread of such theories in Germany, they were reassured by the Imperial Government's solemn acceptance of the 1907 Hague Conventions and of the moral principles laid down therein as follows: —

Article 2. The inhabitants of a territory which has not been occupied, who, on the approach of the enemy, spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading troops without having had time to organize themselves in accordance with Article 1, shall be regarded as belligerents if they carry arms openly and if they respect the laws and customs of war.

Article 3. The armed forces of the belligerent parties may consist of combatants and non-combatants. In the case of capture by the enemy, both have a right to be treated as prisoners of war.

Article 6. The State may utilize the labor of prisoners of

war, according to their rank and aptitude, officers excepted. The tasks shall not be excessive and shall have no connection with the operations of the war.

Article 22. The right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited.

Article 23. In addition to the prohibitions provided by special conventions, it is specially forbidden: —

(*a*) To employ poison or poisonous weapons;

(*b*) To kill or wound treacherously individuals belonging to the hostile nation or army;

(*c*) To kill or wound an enemy who, having laid down his arms, or having no longer means of defense, has surrendered at discretion;

(*d*) To declare that no quarter will be given;

(*e*) To employ arms, projectiles, or material calculated to cause unnecessary suffering;

(*f*) To make improper use of a flag of truce, of the national flag or of the military insignia and uniform of the enemy, as well as the distinctive badges of the Geneva Convention;

(*g*) To destroy or seize the enemy's property, unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessity of war;

(*h*) To declare abolished, suspended, or inadmissible in a court of law the rights and actions of the nationals of the hostile party.

A belligerent is likewise forbidden to compel the nationals of the hostile party to take part in the operations of war directed against their own country, even if they were in the belligerent's service before the commencement of the war.

Article 27. In sieges and bombardments all necessary steps must be taken to spare, as far as possible, buildings dedicated to religion, art, science or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals, and places where the sick and wounded are collected, provided they are not being used at the time for military purposes.

It is the duty of the besieged to indicate the presence of such buildings or places by distinctive signs, which shall be notified to the enemy beforehand.

Article 28. The pillage of a town or place, even when taken by assault, is prohibited.

Article 45. It is forbidden to compel the inhabitants of occupied territory to swear allegiance to the hostile Power.

Article 46. Family honor and rights, the lives of persons, and private property, as well as religious convictions and practice, must be respected.

Private property cannot be confiscated.

Article 47. Pillage is formally prohibited.

Article 49. If, in addition to the taxes mentioned in the above article, the occupant levies other money contributions in the occupied territory, this shall only be for the needs of the army or of the administration of the territory in question.

Article 50. No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, shall be inflicted upon the population on account of the acts of individuals for which they cannot be regarded as jointly and severally responsible.

Article 52. Requisitions in kind and services shall not be demanded from municipalities or inhabitants except for the needs of the army of occupation. They shall be in proportion to the resources of the country, and of such a nature as not to involve the inhabitants in the obligation of taking part in military operations against their country.

Such requisitions and services shall only be demanded on the authority of the commander in the locality occupied.

Contributions in kind shall as far as possible be paid for in cash; if not, a receipt shall be given and the payment of the amount due shall be made as soon as possible.

Article 53. An army of occupation can only take possession of cash, funds, and realizable securities which are strictly the property of the State, dépôts of arms, means of transport, stores and supplies, and, generally, all movable property belonging to the State which may be used for military operations.

All appliances, whether on land, at sea, or in the air, adapted for the transmission of news, or for the transport of persons or things, exclusive of cases governed by naval law, dépôts of arms and, generally, all kinds of ammunition of

war, may be seized, even if they belong to private individuals, but must be restored and compensation fixed when peace is made.

Article 55. The occupying State shall be regarded only as administrator and usufructuary of public buildings, real estate, forests, and agricultural estates belonging to the hostile State, and situated in the occupied country. It must safeguard the capital of these properties, and administer them in accordance with the rules of usufruct.

Article 56. The property of municipalities, that of institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, even when State property, shall be treated as private property.

All seizure of, destruction, or willful damage done to institutions of this character, historic monuments, works of art and science, is forbidden, and should be made the subject of legal proceedings.

The 1907 Convention was ratified by the following signatory powers on the dates indicated: —

Austria-Hungary	November 27, 1909
Belgium	August 8, 1910
Bolivia	November 27, 1909
Brazil	January 5, 1914
Cuba	February 22, 1912
Denmark	November 27, 1909
France	October 7, 1910
Germany	November 27, 1909
Great Britain	November 27, 1909
Guatemala	March 15, 1911
Haiti	February 2, 1910
Japan	December 13, 1911
Luxemburg	September 5, 1912
Mexico	November 27, 1909
Netherlands	November 27, 1909
Norway	September 19, 1910
Panama	September 11, 1911
Portugal	April 13, 1911
Rumania	March 1, 1912
Russia	November 27, 1909

Salvador	November 27, 1909
Siam	March 12, 1910
Sweden	November 27, 1909
Switzerland	May 12, 1910
United States	November 27, 1909

Adhesions: —

Liberia	February 4, 1914
Nicaragua	December 16, 1909

The following powers signed the Convention, but have not yet ratified: —

Argentine Republic
Bulgaria
Chile
Columbia
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Greece
Italy
Montenegro
Paraguay
Persia
Peru
Servia
Turkey
Uruguay
Venezuela

CHAPTER XIV

THE NEUTRALITY OF BELGIUM

I. Early History

There are three nations in Europe whose neutrality is guaranteed by the great powers, Switzerland (1815), Belgium (1839), and Luxemburg (1867).

The effect of the treaty between England, France, Germany, Austria, and Russia guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium was to constitute Belgium a barrier or a buffer state. The treaty was of advantage to Prussia as affording a barrier state against France. It was agreed to by France because she saw no hope of being allowed to annex Belgium.

Von Moltke — the elder — dealing with the basic military policy of Prussia in 1858, said: —

> Belgium sees in France the only actual enemy to her independence; she considers England, Prussia, and even Holland, as her best allies. . . . If we respect Belgium's neutrality we will protect thereby the largest part of our western frontier.

For many years the guaranteed neutrality of Belgium helped to protect Prussia from France.

Much later, since the formation of the German Empire, Karl Hildebrand writes: —

> But far more prominent and more considerable [than the interest of France] is the interest of Germany in the maintenance of the Belgian state and its neutrality. Belgium takes the place to Germany of a whole army and a chain of fortresses. . . . It is thanks to this neutrality that the war of 1870 did not degenerate into a world-wide war, and if —

which God forbid — such an impious war were to arise again, doubtless the same phenomena would be reproduced.

At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck wrote to the Belgian Minister in Berlin on July 22, 1870: —

> In confirmation of my verbal assurance, I have the honor to give in writing a declaration, which, in view of the treaties in force, is quite superfluous, that the Confederation of the North and its allies [Germany] will respect the neutrality of Belgium on the understanding of course that it is respected by the other belligerent.

Belgium was a barrier state for England, because the guaranteed neutralization of Belgium prevented a strong power from getting control of the coast and threatening England. Early in 1852 Queen Victoria wrote to the King of the Belgians, assuring him against the alleged designs of Napoleon III, and stating, "Any attempt on Belgium would be *casus belli* for us."

Mr. David Jayne Hill, an eminent authority on international law, says: —

> While this arrangement prevents making their territories the scene of hostilities, it does not deprive these States of the right of self-defense. On the contrary, it imposes upon them the duty of defending their neutrality to the best of their ability; but, as they enjoy the guaranty of the powers that they will aid them in this respect, it is improbable that their neutrality will ever be violated.

The neutralization of Belgium has a counterpart in the Monroe Doctrine of the United States. This doctrine originated in conversations between Ministers of the United States at London and members of the

British Government. Its enforcement has not depended on a treaty because its principles accord with the interests of the United States and England.

II. The German Case against Belgium

When Von Bethmann-Hollweg announced the opening of the war in his speech in the Reichstag, August 4, 1914, he said in part: —

> Gentlemen, we are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and perhaps have already entered Belgian territory.
>
> Gentlemen, that is a breach of international law. . . . The wrong — I speak openly — the wrong we thereby commit we will try to make good as soon as our military aims have been attained.

But the violation of Belgium, and the subsequent terrorization as set forth by Cardinal Mercier and by the proclamation of German generals, as well as by other testimony, caused a tremendous hostility to Germany. Dr. Bernhard Dernburg came to the United States to get a hearing for Germany's side. Dr. Dernburg knew America well. He had spent many years in financial circles in New York City. In the widely circulated weekly, the "Saturday Evening Post" (Philadelphia), he took the bull by the horns in these words: —

> When the war broke out there was no enforceable treaty in existence to which Germany was a party. Originally, in 1839, a treaty was concluded, providing for such neutrality. In 1866 France demanded of Prussia the right to take possession of Belgium, and the written French offer was made known by Bismarck in July, 1870. Then England demanded and obtained separate treaties with France, and with the

North German Federation, to the effect that they should respect Belgium's neutrality, and such treaties were signed on the 9th and 26th of August, 1870, respectively. According to them, both countries guaranteed Belgium's neutrality for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter. The war came to an end with the Frankfort peace in 1871, and the treaty between Belgium and the North German Federation expired in May, 1872.

Now, it may be said that if Dr. Dernburg is right, the Ministers of the German Government were wrong.

Baron Beyens, the Belgian Minister to Berlin, informed his Government under date of May 2, 1913, as follows: —

I have the honor of informing you, according to the semi-official "Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," of the declarations made in the course of the sitting of the 29th of April [1913] of the Budget Committee of the Reichstag by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Minister of War with reference to Belgian neutrality.

A member of the Social Democratic Party said "In Belgium the approach of a Franco-German war is viewed with apprehension, because it is feared that Germany will not respect Belgian neutrality."

Herr von Jagow, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, replied: "The neutrality of Belgium is determined by international conventions, and Germany is resolved to respect these conventions."

This declaration did not satisfy another member of the Social Democratic Party. Herr von Jagow observed that he had nothing to add to the clear statement which he had uttered with reference to the relations between Germany and Belgium.

In reply to further interrogations from a member of the Social Democratic Party, Herr von Heeringen, Minister of War, stated, "Belgium does not play any part in the justification of the German scheme of military reorganization; the scheme is justified by the position of matters in the East.

Germany will not lose sight of the fact that Belgian neutrality is guaranteed by international treaties."

A member of the Progressive Party having again referred to Belgium, Herr von Jagow again pointed out that his declaration regarding Belgium was sufficiently clear.

To my mind the Ministers of the German Government were right and Dr. Dernburg was wrong.

In the Treaty of 1870, Article 3, occurs this provision as quoted by Dr. Dernburg: —

Art. 3. This treaty shall be binding on the High Contracting Parties during the continuance of the present war between the North German Confederation and France, and for 12 months after the ratification of any treaty of peace concluded between those parties;

It will be noticed that the quotation ends with a semicolon. Dr. Dernburg does not complete the sentence. Here is the complete article: —

Art. 3. This treaty shall be binding on the High Contracting Parties during the continuance of the present war between the North German Confederation and France, and for 12 months after the ratification of any treaty of peace concluded between those parties; and on the expiration of that time the independence and neutrality of Belgium will, so far as the High Contracting Parties are respectively concerned, continue to rest as heretofore on the first article of the Quintuple Treaty of the 19th of April, 1839.

Now it may be said, without reflecting on the intelligence of the readers of the "Saturday Evening Post," that but very few of them could know of the very important partial suppression of a very important treaty, but there can be no doubt that the part of the treaty suppressed by Dr. Dernburg was known to the German Government.

It has been claimed by German authorities that the

treaty of Belgian neutrality was not binding on the German Empire, because it was made by Prussia. Every American will remember, however, that in the Frye case the German Government cited a provision in a treaty made between Prussia and the United States in the eighteenth century. Further, we must accuse the Ministers of the German Government of hypocrisy if their promises to respect Belgian neutrality were made, because of "international conventions," knowing that there were no treaty obligations.

Further, if the Treaty of 1839 had ceased to exist, Belgium would have the status of other neutral countries like Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and the violation of her neutrality would be equally a crime against civilization.

When the war in 1870 between France and Prussia broke out, there was acute anxiety as to Belgium caused by the publication of a memorandum in the handwriting of Napoleon III's envoy to Prussia expressing the wish of the French Emperor to annex Belgium. At the outbreak of the war the English Government questioned the two belligerents as to their intentions toward Belgium. Each replied that he would respect the neutrality of Belgium unless the other first violated it. Then Great Britain made an identical treaty with the French and German Governments. This is a copy of the treaty between England and Prussia: —

Treaty between Great Britain and Prussia, relative to the Independence and Neutrality of Belgium

Signed at London, 9th August, 1870
Reference to Treaties of 19th April, 1839

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and His Majesty the King of Prussia,

being desirous at the present time of recording in a solemn Act their fixed determination to maintain the Independence and Neutrality of Belgium, as provided in Article VII of the Treaty signed at London on the 19th April, 1839, between Belgium and the Netherlands, which Article was declared by the Quintuple Treaty of 1839 to be considered as having the same force and value as if textually inserted in the said Quintuple Treaty, their said Majesties have determined to conclude between themselves a separate Treaty, which, without impairing or invalidating the conditions of the said Quintuple Treaty, shall be subsidiary and accessory to it; and they have accordingly named as their Plenipotentiaries for that purpose, that is to say: —

. . . . . .

Coöperation of Great Britain with Prussia in case of violation of Neutrality of Belgium by France

Article I. His Majesty the King of Prussia having declared that notwithstanding the Hostilities in which the North German Confederation is engaged with France, it is his fixed determination to respect the Neutrality of Belgium, so long as the same shall be respected by France, Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland on her part declares that, if during the said Hostilities the Armies of France should violate that Neutrality, she will be prepared to coöperate with His Prussian Majesty for the defence of the same in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon, employing for that purpose her Naval and Military Forces to insure its observance, and to maintain, in conjunction with His Prussian Majesty, then and thereafter the Independence and Neutrality of Belgium.

. . . . . .

Great Britain not engaged to take part in war between North German Confederation and France, except as regards violation of Belgian Neutrality

It is clearly understood that Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland does not

engage herself by this Treaty to take part in any of the general operations of the War now carried on between the North German Confederation and France, beyond the Limits of Belgium, as defined in the Treaty between Belgium and the Netherlands of 19th April, 1839.

Coöperation of Prussia with Great Britain in case of Violation of Neutrality of Belgium by France

Article II. His Majesty the King of Prussia agrees on his part, in the event provided for in the foregoing Article, to coöperate with Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, employing his Naval and Military Forces for the purpose aforesaid; and, the case arising, to concert with Her Majesty the measures which shall be taken, separately or in common, to secure the Neutrality and Independence of Belgium.

Treaty to be binding until conclusion of a Treaty of Peace between France and Prussia

Article III. This Treaty shall be binding on the High Contracting Parties during the continuance of the present War between the North German Confederation and France, and for 12 months after the Ratification of any Treaty of Peace concluded between those Parties; and on the expiration of that time the Independence and Neutrality of Belgium will, so far as the High Contracting Parties are respectively concerned, continue to rest as heretofore on Article I of the Quintuple Treaty of the 19th April, 1839.

At the same time England made a similar treaty with France. In connection with the discussion in Parliament as to this treaty, Mr. Gladstone made this speech, which is so often quoted:—

There is, I admit, the obligation of the Treaty [of 1839]. It is not necessary, nor would time permit me, to enter into the complicated question of the nature of the obligations of that Treaty; but I am not able to subscribe to the doctrine of

those who have held in this House what plainly amounts to an assertion that the simple fact of the existence of a guarantee is binding on every party to it irrespectively altogether of the particular position in which it may find itself at the time when the occasion for acting on the guarantee arises. The great authorities upon foreign policy to whom I have been accustomed to listen — such as Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston — never, to my knowledge, took that rigid, and if I may venture to say so, that impracticable view of a guarantee. The circumstance that there is already an existing guarantee in force is of necessity an important fact, and a weighty element in the case, to which we are bound to give full and ample consideration. There is also this further consideration, the force of which we must all feel most deeply, and that is the common interest against the unmeasured aggrandizement of any power whatever.

But there is one other motive, which I shall place at the head of all, that attaches peculiarly to the preservation of the independence of Belgium. What is that country? It is a country containing 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of people, with much of an historic past, and imbued with a sentiment of nationality and a spirit of independence as warm and as genuine as that which beats in the hearts of the proudest and most powerful nations. By the regulation of its internal concerns, amid the shocks of revolution, Belgium, through all the crises of the age, has set to Europe an example of a good and stable government gracefully associated with the widest possible extension of the liberty of the people. Looking at a country such as this, is there any man who hears me who does not feel that if, in order to satisfy a greedy appetite for aggrandizement, coming whence it may, Belgium were absorbed, the day that witnessed that absorption would hear the knell of public right and public law in Europe?

But we have an interest in the independence of Belgium which is wider than that — which is wider than that which we may have in the literal operation of the guarantee. It is found in the answer to the question whether, under the circumstances of the case, this country, endowed as it is with influence and power, would quietly stand by and witness the

perpetration of the direst crime that ever stained the pages of history, and thus become participators in the sin? . . .

But in what, then, lies the difference between the two Treaties? It is in this — that, in accordance with our obligations, we should have had to act under the Treaty of 1839 without stipulated assurance of being supported from any quarter whatever against any combination, however formidable; whereas by the Treaty now formally before Parliament, under the conditions laid down in it, we secure powerful support in the event of our having to act. . . .

It is perfectly true that this is a cumulative Treaty, added to the Treaty of 1839, as the right honorable gentleman opposite [Mr. Disraeli], with perfect precision, described it. . . .

The Treaty of 1839 loses nothing of its force even during the existence of this present Treaty. There is no derogation from it whatever. The Treaty of 1839 includes terms which are expressly included in the present instrument, lest by any chance it should be said that in consequence of the existence of this instrument, the Treaty of 1839 had been injured or impaired.

The first part of Gladstone's speech has been used to support the contention that a nation may under certain conditions fail to fulfill its treaty obligations. On this point I quote Professor E. C. Stowell, of Columbia University: —

What Gladstone undoubtedly meant by this was that the English statesmen perceived that the whole brunt of maintaining the Belgian neutrality rested upon their shoulders, and that though they intended to take every means to make good the engagement into which they had entered, they did not feel that England was in honor bound, where the odds were too great against her, to stake her national existence in the defense of Belgian neutrality.

Gladstone has been criticized for this frank expression, and in truth his speech seems to present a confusion of ideas which lays him open to criticism. In reality, however, his stand was perfectly justified, for otherwise, in agreeing to

the neutrality of Belgium, England would have been digging a pit into which she herself might later have fallen. Gladstone could not have meant that England would ever shirk her obligation to participate in any reasonable measures to make good the guaranty. England's vital interests would surely recommend such a course; but it would have been an impracticable view of the obligation which would have sent England to her doom in the face of a great Continental combination intent upon violating the obligation imposed by the Treaty of 1839.

If, for example, Russia, Germany, France and Austria had combined to destroy the neutrality of Belgium, English intervention would have been useless. To violate the treaty, however, is different from fighting to maintain it under any circumstances.

The other portions of Mr. Gladstone's speech present the British Monroe Doctrine as to Belgium. There can be no doubt that Queen Victoria's words in her letter to the King of the Belgians in 1852 were true for England for all time.

The universal conviction in Germany is that Belgium was one of the enemy nations that had conspired to attack Germany. I will now consider the principal basis of this belief — the documents found by the German military forces in the archives of the Belgian Government in Brussels.

The first document is a letter by General Ducarne, Chief of the Belgian General Staff, to the Belgian Minister of War, dated Brussels, April 10, 1906. It details the second conversation with Lieutenant-Colonel Barnardiston, the British Military Attaché. These conversations dealt with the technical questions involved in the coöperation of British troops with the Belgian forces.

The conditions under which those military operations would take place are set forth in the following paragraph of the document:—

He [Colonel Barnardiston] proceeded in the following sense: The landing of the English troops would take place at the French coast in the vicinity of Dunkirk and Calais, so as to hasten their movements as much as possible. The entry of the English into Belgium would take place only after the violation of our neutrality by Germany. A landing in Antwerp would take much more time, because larger transports would be needed, and because, on the other hand, the safety would be less complete.

Farther on in the margin is a note by the Belgian general as follows:—

The entry of the English into Belgium would only take place after the violation of our neutrality by Germany.

The question arises, Did these negotiations bind the respective Governments? The document contains the following paragraph:—

After having expressed his full satisfaction with my explanations, my visitor laid emphasis on the following facts: (1) that our conversation was entirely confidential; (2) that it was not binding on his Government; (3) that his Minister, the English General Staff, he and I were, up to the present, the only ones informed about the matter; (4) that he did not know whether the opinion of his Sovereign had been consulted.

The second document bears the date of April 23, and it is believed that the year was 1912. I print the document in full:—

The British Military Attaché asked to see General Jungbluth. The two gentlemen met on April 23.

Lieutenant-Colonel Bridges told the General that England

had at her disposal an army which could be sent to the Continent composed of six divisions of infantry and eight brigades of cavalry — together 160,000 troops. She has also everything which is necessary for her to defend her insular territory. Everything is ready.

At the time of the recent events, the British Government would have immediately effected a disembarkment in Belgium, even if we had not asked for assistance.

The General objected that for that our consent was necessary.

The Military Attaché answered that he knew this, but that — since we were not able to prevent the Germans from passing through our country — England would have landed her troops in Belgium under all circumstances.

As for the place of landing, the Military Attaché did not make a precise statement: he said that the coast was rather long, but the General knows that Mr. Bridges, during Easter has paid daily visits to Zeebrugge from Ostende.

The General added that we were, besides, perfectly able to prevent the Germans from passing through.

It is believed in Germany that this document proves that England proposed to invade Belgium as soon as a Franco-German war broke out. And this document constitutes to the German people the absolute justification of the German invasion of Belgium.

If the Governments of Belgium and England had agreed to invade Germany with their combined forces in case of a Franco-German war, irrespective of a prior entry by Germany, Belgium would have forfeited any protection she might claim from the Treaty of 1839. But even so, until Belgium had declared war, or engaged in hostilities, she was not, according to the law of nations, subject to attack. France was closely allied with Russia, but if France had decided to remain out of the war, Germany could not rightfully have attacked

her. Italy was allied to Germany and Austria, but she was not subject to attack by the forces of England and France.

Let us place the most extreme construction on the words of the Military Attaché of Great Britain, and let us assume that he spoke with the full authority of his Government, and let us further assume that Great Britain meant to invade Germany through Belgium, not waiting until Belgium's neutrality was violated. Even so Belgium's record is clear. The Belgian General "objected that for that our consent was necessary." The Belgian General further said "we were, besides, perfectly able to prevent the Germans from passing through."

From these statements it would seem that the Belgian Government contemplated a situation in which military action on the part of England and Belgium would only follow the invasion of Belgium by Germany.

There was undoubtedly a great deal of anxiety in Belgium as to her fate if a war broke out between Germany and France. It will be noticed that when Von Jagow, the German Secretary of State, and Von Heeringen, the German Minister of War, made their statements in the Reichstag, as to the German attitude toward the neutrality of Belgium, the Belgian Minister at Berlin at once communicated the reassuring statements to his Government.

Also the Belgian Government must have asked the intentions of the English Government, for we have this letter from the British Foreign Office: —

Foreign Office, April 7, 1913.

Sir: —

In speaking to the Belgian Minister to-day I said, speaking unofficially, that it had been brought to my knowledge that there was apprehension in Belgium lest we should be the first to violate Belgian neutrality. I did not think that this apprehension could have come from a British source.

The Belgian Minister informed me that there had been talk, in a British source which he could not name, of the landing of troops in Belgium by Great Britain, in order to anticipate a possible dispatch of German troops through Belgium to France.

I said I was sure that this Government would not be the first to violate the neutrality of Belgium, and I did not believe that any British Government would be the first to do so, nor would public opinion here ever approve of it. What we had to consider, and it was a somewhat embarrassing question, was what it would be desirable and necessary for us, as one of the guarantors of Belgian neutrality, to do if Belgian neutrality was violated by any power. For us to be the first to violate it and to send troops into Belgium would be to give Germany, for instance, justification for sending troops into Belgium also. What we desired in the case of Belgium, as in that of other neutral countries, was that their neutrality should be respected, and as long as it was not violated by any other power we should certainly not send troops ourselves into their territory.

I am, etc.,

E. Grey.

We have conclusive proof of the correct action of the Belgian Government in the statement King Albert made in the "New York World," March 22, 1915: —

No honest man could have acted otherwise than I did. Belgium never departed for an instant nor in the slightest degree from the strictest neutrality, and Belgium was always the loyal friend of each and every one of the powers that

guaranteed her neutrality. At first, Germany openly admitted that in violating the neutrality of Belgium she was doing a wrong, but now, for the purposes of a campaign of propaganda in neutral countries, an attempt is being made to cast a slur upon Belgium and hold her up to scorn as having perfidiously departed from her neutrality in connection with the so-called "Anglo-Belgian Convention" of which so much is being made.

I can say this: No one in Belgium ever gave the name of "Anglo-Belgian Conventions" to the letter of General Ducarne to the Minister of War, detailing the entirely informal conversations with the British Military Attaché, but I was so desirous of avoiding even the semblance of anything that might be construed as un-neutral that I had the matters, of which it is now sought to make so much, communicated to the German Military Attaché in Brussels. When the Germans went through our archives, they knew exactly what they would find, and all their present surprise and indignation is assumed.

It is difficult to see how any one can find from these documents any guilt attaching to Belgium. As to England, we not only have the letter of Sir Edward Grey, but the fact that for England to destroy the guaranteed neutrality of Belgium would be very seriously to injure her own interests.

III. Side-Lights on Belgian Diplomacy, 1905 to 1914

At no time in the history of the United States has the Monroe Doctrine been more important to her interests than were the neutrality and independence of Belgium to the interests of England before the outbreak of the present war.

In a semi-official dispatch from Berlin, January 16, 1917, Germany answers England by a series of questions. The last question is as follows: —

Why did the British Government prohibit the publication of reports of Belgian Ministers about the encircling policy of England? Is it ashamed of its own actions?

This question refers to a publication by the German Government of the diplomatic dispatches from the Belgian Ministers at London, Paris, and Berlin for the ten years 1905 to 1914. I examined this book in Germany, and I have a copy of it from which I make some extracts from the introduction. I also quote several of these dispatches.

Statement by the German Foreign Office

Among the sources to which the historian will resort, the documents which are herewith presented to the world will rank high. They consist of reports made to the Belgian Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Baron de Favereau and M. Davignon, by the Belgian Ministers at the chief European capitals — Count de Lalaing at London; M. A. Leghait and later Baron Guillaume at Paris; Baron Greindl and then Baron Beyens at Berlin — from the year 1905 to 1914.

The correspondence was found in the archives of the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the occupation of Brussels by German forces.

The picture which these Ministers unite in drawing is that of the sinister figure of England moving with ever malevolent purpose among the courts and chancelleries of Europe, everywhere fomenting suspicions and inspiring hatred of the Power which it has set its mind to destroy. In the pursuit of this purpose we see King Edward in the closing days of his reign devoting himself to the dissipation of the longstanding Anglo-French antipathy and the creation of the *rapprochement* which Lord Lansdowne and Sir Edward Grey strengthened into an alliance. . . . The calendar of the years 1905–1914 is unrolled by these diplomatic diarists, and the story of the British influence on French internal affairs during the decade, of British influence on French foreign

policy at the Algeciras Conference and in Morocco, and in the successive Balkan crises, is recounted.

That British foreign policy during the last ten years has had as its central motive the isolation of Germany is of course no secret either to diplomatists or to laymen; but the extreme degree to which this motive ruled, the never-sleeping assiduity with which it was pursued, the Machiavellian ingenuity with which every occasion to forward it was taken advantage of, will hardly have been recognized by any who have not perused the documents in which these detached and disinterested spectators of the game recorded it as it went forward.

Every report, every paragraph of every report, reveals the fact that the neutral diplomatists recognize that it was the never-forgotten aim of Great Britain to raise up enemies to Germany on every hand, to frustrate her every endeavor, no matter how innocent of harm to others; and that in pursuance of this aim England never hesitated to jeopardize the peace of Europe.

Such is the story which these pages spread before us.

It is away back in 1905 (September 23) that we find the Belgian Minister at Berlin, Baron Greindl, writing in this wise:—

> The unheard-of efforts made by the English press to prevent a peaceful settlement of the Moroccan affair and the probably insincere credulity with which it receives all calumnies aimed at the German policy show how ready public opinion in Great Britain is to acclaim any combination hostile to Germany.

As to the attitude of Germany, writing on the last day of the year 1905, the Belgian Minister at Berlin tells his home office that it has been " the highest ambition of His Majesty (the German Emperor) to preserve peace during his entire reign."

The peculiar tactics historically characteristic of English foreign policy are recognized in the memorandum of October 27, 1905, by the Belgian Minister in Berlin in these words:—

> An insurmountable mistrust of England is prevalent here. A great number of Germans are convinced that England is either seeking allies for an attack against Germany, or, which would be more in conformity with the British traditions, is endeavoring to stir up a war on the Continent in which she would not take part and of which she would reap the benefit.

In the same memorandum the Minister goes on: —

> While England is safe from attacks, Germany, on the contrary, is very vulnerable. In attacking Germany simply to annihilate a rival, England would only follow her old tracks. She destroyed successfully the Dutch fleet in accord with Louis XIV, subsequently the French fleet, and, finally, even the Danish fleet, in the midst of peace and without any provocation, simply because it represented a respectable naval force.

The Belgian Minister at Berlin, expressing his skepticism regarding the effect of the approaching visit of the Lord Mayor of London to Berlin, writes (June 8, 1907): —

> As Count de Lalaing rightly says, the King of England is personally directing a policy the ultimate aim of which is the isolation of Germany. His action corresponds with the sentiments of the nation, misled by an unscrupulous press, the sole interest of which consists in a large circulation, and which is therefore only anxious to flatter the passions of the populace.

Baron Greindl's report to his Government repeatedly referred to the Barnardiston-Ducarne episode; for instance, writing April 18, 1907, he says: —

> This zeal in uniting Powers whom no one is menacing for alleged purposes of defense, can with good reason seem suspicious. The offer of 100,000 men made by the King of England to M. Delcassé cannot be forgotten in Berlin. We ourselves have to record the singular overtures made by Colonel Barnardiston to General Ducarne, and who knows if there have not been other

similar intrigues which have not come to our knowledge?

Reporting to his Government February 10, 1907, M. Leghait, Belgian Minister at Paris, writes: —

> France, who sincerely desires to maintain peace and to improve her relations with Germany, will have to make great efforts of diplomacy if she wishes to demonstrate at Berlin that the *Entente Cordiale* need not be obnoxious to Germany and that it was not concluded to put obstacles in the way of her expansion.
>
> It is realized here so well that France is in a delicate situation and *has been dragged into a dangerous game*, that all the semi-official organs and other serious papers are keeping silent on this occasion and that none of them dares to show pleasure in this new demonstration of English friendship.

In view of the unspeakable calamities which have fallen upon the French Republic and the Kingdom of Belgium in consequence of her implication in the British plot against Germany, it is sadly interesting to note that as early as June 17, 1907, the Belgian Minister to France, M. Leghait, was writing solemn warnings to his Government in this fashion: —

> England is preparing her ground admirably, but has France, who is joining her in her policy, all the necessary guarantees that she will not be the victim of this policy one day? The uncertainty which prevails in regard to this subject justifies the supposition that *there exists between her and the British Government a more complete agreement than that of the Entente Cordiale, but which will remain latent until that day when events will demand that its stipulations be made public.*
>
> In order to arm herself for the moment against perils which are perhaps illusory, or in order to strengthen the position of the directors of her internal policy, *France is contracting a debt of gratitude which will seem heavy to her on the day when England will reveal the pur-*

pose for which she wants to use the influences which she had grouped around herself.

These words were written seven years before the day which they prophesied broke in sorrow over France.

Great Britain's *rapprochement* with Russia was becoming a possibility in 1905. As early as October 14 of that year Baron Greindl, the Belgian Minister at Berlin, writes to his Minister of Foreign Affairs: —

> England at the present time shows no interest whatsoever in the fate of Turkey, whose preservation has for such a long time been the leading principle of her policy. She may leave Russia a free hand in Asia Minor. Such a combination would, moreover, *have the advantage of embroiling Russia with Germany, whose isolation is at present the principal aim of the English policy.*

On January 25, 1908, we see Baron Greindl writing: —

> The policy directed by King Edward VII, under the pretext of guarding Europe from the imaginary German peril, has created a French danger which is only too real, and which is a *menace above all to us* [to Belgium].

The Belgian Minister in Berlin, reporting home (December 6, 1911), sees matters precisely as does his colleague in London: —

> Everybody in England and France considers the *Entente Cordiale* as a defensive and offensive alliance against Germany. That is the character which the late King of England wanted to impart to it. The *Entente Cordiale* was founded not on the positive basis of defense of common interests, but on the negative basis of hatred against the German Empire. . . . It is the *Entente Cordiale* that revived in France the idea of revenge, which had already abated considerably. It is the *Entente Cordiale* that causes the state of unrest and uneasiness in which Europe has been writhing for seven years.

Baron Greindl takes up particularly the suspicion that England had had in preparation a military expedition on the Continent. He refers to the fact that Sir Edward Grey refrained from denying the truth of the charges to this effect, and he says: —

> In default of other information it must be considered as an established fact that the plan had been discussed in London of aiding France in a war with Germany by landing an English corps of 150,000 men. There is nothing in this which ought to surprise us. It is the continuation of the singular proposals which were made a few years ago to General Ducarne by Colonel Barnardiston, as well as of the Flushing intrigue.

Baron Greindl comments sarcastically on the fact that: —

> A hue and cry was raised because a German cruiser had cast anchor in the roadstead of Agadir, whereas England had not moved a muscle when watching the progressing conquest of Moroccan territory by France and Spain and the overthrow of the Sultan's independence.
>
> England could not do otherwise. She was bound by her secret treaty with France.

So late as May 8, 1914, Baron Guillaume, Belgian Minister at Paris, reports that the three years' military service law, imposed upon the country by the military party, "will have to be given up, or *war will have to be waged before two years from to-day have elapsed.*" It was less than two years, it was less than three months, before Baron Guillaume's apprehensions were realized.

It can surely not be necessary to dilate upon the meaning of the narrative set forth in these luminous, but disheartening, pages. These are not the words of German apologists. They are the words of disinterested expert observers — the considered words, though set down in the very midst of events as they pass. They register the convictions of five professional students of contemporary international history,

living in the three chief capitals of Europe, and possessing unparalleled access to the facts, with the advantage of being detached and unprejudiced with regard to them. And their convictions are identical. A more complete indictment of English statesmanship as the enemy of the peace of the world, a deliberate and persistent conspirator against an unoffending neighbor, could not possibly be framed. The indictment stretches throughout the nine years. There are no palliations, no extenuations. It is a record of a monstrous crime.

These quotations are made from the article written by the officials of the German Foreign Office, introductory to the dispatches sent by the Belgian Ministers to England, France, and Germany, the only three countries whose relations concerned Belgium deeply. No German publicist — Rohrbach, Schiemann, Reventlow — could have written anything more bitterly hostile to England than these dispatches, or more friendly to Germany. Is it not a fair assumption that if the Belgian Ministers from 1905 to 1914 possessed such sentiments, the Belgian Government could not have been hostile to these sentiments and have retained these Ministers? One may fairly assume that the Belgian Government had not been unfriendly to Germany, nor unduly friendly to England.

It is also interesting in this connection that the Belgian King had visited Vienna and Berlin, and had not yet visited London. Further, it was noticed at the Hague Conferences that Belgium was on the side of Germany, in opposition to most of the Powers, in regard to the question of treaties of arbitration.

The feeling of Belgium in regard to the military conversations is expressed by Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin, on April 24, 1914: —

For us, the most interesting point in connection with the visit of the Sovereigns of Great Britain is to know whether the British Government would be as inclined to-day, as three years ago, to range itself by the side of France in the case of a conflict of the latter with Germany; we have had the proof that a coöperation of the British army and the dispatching of an expeditionary corps to the Continent have been considered by the military authorities of the two Governments [England and France].

Would it be the same to-day, and should we still have to fear the entry of British soldiers into Belgium in order to help us defend our neutrality by first compromising it?

We have, however, the most convincing proof of the correctness of Belgium's attitude in a dispatch from Baron Greindl, the Belgian Minister at Berlin (who preceded Baron Beyens), dated Berlin, December 23, 1911: —

Evidently the project of an outflanking movement from the north forms part of the scheme of the *Entente Cordiale*. If that were not the case, then the plan of fortifying Flushing would not have called forth such an outburst in Paris and London. The reason why they wished that the Scheldt should remain unfortified was hardly concealed by them. Their aim was to be able to transport an English garrison, unhindered, to Antwerp, which means to establish in our country a basis of operation [*sic*] for an offensive in the direction of the Lower Rhine and Westphalia, and then to make us throw our lot in with them, which would not be difficult, for, after the surrender of our national center of refuge, we would, through our own fault, have renounced every possibility of opposing the demands of our doubtful protectors, after having been so unwise as to permit their entrance into our country. Colonel Barnardiston's announcements at the time of the conclusion of the *Entente Cordiale*, which were just as perfidious as they were naïve, have shown us plainly the true meaning of things. When it became evident that we would not allow ourselves to be frightened by the pre-

tended danger of the closing of the Scheldt, the plan was not entirely abandoned, but modified in so far as the British army was not to land on the Belgian coast, but at the nearest French harbors.

The revelations of Captain Faber, which were denied as little as the newspaper reports by which they were confirmed or completed in several respects, also testify to this. This British army, at Calais and Dunkirk, would by no means march along our frontier to Longwy in order to reach Germany. It would directly invade Belgium from the northwest. That would give it the advantage of being able to begin operations immediately, to encounter the Belgian army in a region where we could not depend on any fortress, in case we wanted to risk a battle. Moreover, that would make it possible for it to occupy provinces rich in all kinds of resources, and, at any rate, to prevent our mobilization or only to permit it after we had formally pledged ourselves to carry on our mobilization to the exclusive advantage of England and her allies.

It is therefore of necessity to prepare a plan of battle for the Belgian army, also, for that possibility. This is necessary in the interest of our military defense, as well as for the sake of the direction of our foreign policy, in case of war between Germany and France.

If there had been an agreement between Belgium and the Entente Powers, would this extremely able minister have been ignorant of it?

While these dispatches, covering the period from the Moroccan crisis of 1905 through the Bosnian crisis and the other international troubles of Europe up to 1914, evince a great friendliness to Germany and a great hostility to England and France, there is nothing to indicate that Belgium overstepped the strictest bounds of absolute neutrality in favor of Germany as against England and France.

In fact, Baron Beyens, referring to the period just

before the war (in "Germany Before The War"), writes: —

In the spring of 1914, Germany and Austria-Hungary, who both had old scores to pay off in connection with Morocco and the Balkans respectively, reached the zenith of their military preparations. The German army was ready at all points, and the Austro-Hungarian army was as ready as it can ever be. The airships and aeroplanes were only waiting for the signal to leave their sheds; the heavy guns, an array of monsters, were already marshaled in the artillery parks. All that was wanted was a pretext. As Dr. Schiemann had pointed out in the "Kreuz Zeitung," however, Germany could have a war with France merely by letting Austria fly at Servia's throat. Prophetic words, which a political crime was to bear out, while at the same time it was to give William II the pretext he required for appearing before Europe as an instrument of justice and vengeance!

And again, Baron Beyens writes: —

At a meeting held in Cardiff on the 2d of October, 1914, the Prime Minister made a most interesting disclosure regarding the 1912 attempt to arrive at an understanding. "We said, and we communicated this to the Berlin Government: 'Britain declares that she will neither make nor join in any unprovoked attack upon Germany. Aggression upon Germany is not the subject and forms no part of any treaty, understanding, or combination to which Britain is now a party, nor will she become a party to anything that has such an object.'" But that, Mr. Asquith went on to say, was not enough for German statesmanship. "They wanted us to go further. They asked us to pledge ourselves absolutely to neutrality in the event of Germany's being engaged in war, and this, mind you, at a time when Germany was enormously increasing both her aggressive and defensive resources, and especially upon the sea. They asked us, to put it quite plainly, for a free hand, so far as we were concerned, when they selected the opportunity to overbear and domi-

nate the European world. To such a demand but one answer was possible, and we gave that answer."

From May, 1907, onward the Foreign Minister of Belgium was and is to-day M. Davignon. He was the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs during the seven years 1907 to 1914, when the Belgian Ministers at Paris, London, and Berlin were writing the dispatches found by the German authorities in the archives of the Belgian Government at Brussels and which were published by the Imperial German Foreign Office, with the introduction from which I have drawn so copiously.

It is not likely that M. Davignon would have retained these intensely pro-German Ministers if he had been pro-English in his sympathies. We will now consider his dispatches during the critical week before Belgium was invaded. In accordance with my policy in compiling this book, I prefer to quote documents fully, rather than to summarize them in my own words. The reader is entitled to solid ground in studying the question of Belgium's neutrality, which is so basic in apportioning the responsibility for the tragedy of Belgium.

On July 31, M. Davignon said: —

We have also every reason to believe that the attitude of the German Government will be the same as that of the Government of the French Republic.

I quote his dispatch in full: —

M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Belgian Ministers at Berlin, Paris, and London

Brussels, July 31, 1914.

Sir, —

The French Minister came to show me a telegram from the Agence Havas reporting a state of war in Germany, and said:

I seize this opportunity to declare that no incursion of French troops into Belgium will take place, even if considerable forces are massed upon the frontiers of your country. France does not wish to incur the responsibility, so far as Belgium is concerned, of taking the first hostile act. Instructions in this sense will be given to the French authorities.

I thanked M. Klobukowski for his communication, and I felt bound to observe that we had always had the greatest confidence in the loyal observance by both our neighboring States of their engagements towards us. We have also every reason to believe that the attitude of the German Government will be the same as that of the Government of the French Republic.

From M. Davignon's dispatch of July 31, reporting a conversation with the German Minister at Brussels, it will be seen that he had received no hint of any change in Germany's intentions: —

M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Belgian Ministers at Berlin, London, and Paris

Brussels, July 31, 1914.

Sir, —

In the course of the conversation which the Secretary-General of my Department had with Herr von Below this morning, he explained to the German Minister the scope of the military measures which we had taken, and said to him that they were a consequence of our desire to fulfill our international obligations, and that they in no wise implied an attitude of distrust towards our neighbors.

The Secretary-General then asked the German Minister if he knew of the conversation which he had had with his predecessor, Herr von Flotow, and of the reply which the Imperial Chancellor had instructed the latter to give.

The Department of Foreign Affairs had suggested that a declaration in the German Parliament during a debate on

foreign affairs would serve to calm public opinion, and to dispel the mistrust which was so regrettable from the point of view of the relations between the two countries.

Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg replied that he had fully appreciated the feelings which had inspired our representations. He declared that Germany had no intention of violating Belgian neutrality, but he considered that in making a public declaration Germany would weaken her military position in regard to France, who, secured on the northern side, would concentrate all her energies on the east.

Baron von der Elst, continuing, said that he perfectly understood the objections raised by Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg to the proposed public declaration, and he recalled the fact that since then, in 1913, Herr von Jagow had made reassuring declarations to the Budget Commission of the Reichstag respecting the maintenance of Belgian neutrality.

Herr von Below replied that he knew of the conversation with Herr von Flotow, and that he was certain that the sentiments expressed at that time had not changed.

After England had sent an identical note to the Governments of France and Germany as to their policy in regard to Belgian neutrality, M. Davignon sent the following dispatch to the Belgian Ministers: —

M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to the Belgian Ministers at Berlin, Paris, and London

Brussels, August 1, 1914.

Sir, —

I have the honor to inform you that the French Minister has made the following verbal communication to me: —

> I am authorized to declare that, in the event of an international war, the French Government, in accordance with the declarations they have always made, will respect the neutrality of Belgium. In the event of this neutrality not being respected by another power, the French Government, to secure their own defense, might find it necessary to modify their attitude.

I thanked His Excellency and added that we on our side had taken without delay all the measures necessary to insure that our independence and our frontiers should be respected.

On the same day the British Minister at Brussels sent this dispatch to Sir Edward Grey: —

(Telegraphic.) *Brussels, August 1, 1914.*

The instructions conveyed in your telegram of yesterday have been acted upon.

Belgium expects and desires that other powers will observe and uphold her neutrality, which she intends to maintain to the utmost of her power. In so informing me, Minister for Foreign Affairs said that, in the event of the violation of the neutrality of their territory, they believed that they were in a position to defend themselves against intrusion. The relations between Belgium and her neighbors were excellent, and there was no reason to suspect their intentions; but he thought it well, nevertheless, to be prepared against emergencies.

On August 2, the German Minister at Brussels still believed that the neutrality of Belgium would be respected, as is seen from the following dispatch: —

M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Belgian Ministers at Paris, Berlin, London, Vienna, and St. Petersburg

Brussels, August 2, 1914.

Sir, —

I was careful to warn the German Minister through M. de Bassompierre that an announcement in the Brussels press by M. Klobukowski, French Minister, would make public the formal declaration which the latter had made to me on the 1st August. When I next met Herr von Below he thanked me for this attention, and added that up to the present he had not been instructed to make us an official communication, but that we knew his personal opinion as to the feelings of security which we had the right to enter-

tain towards our eastern neighbors. I at once replied that all that we knew of their intentions, as indicated in numerous previous conversations, did not allow us to doubt their perfect correctness towards Belgium. I added, however, that we should attach the greatest importance to the possession of a formal declaration, which the Belgian nation would hear of with joy and gratitude.

IV. The Tragic Prelude

On August 2, at 7 P.M., the German Minister at Brussels handed the following note to M. Davignon. It was to be answered in twelve hours: —

Reliable information has been received by the German Government to the effect that French forces intend to march on the line of the Meuse by Givet and Namur. This information leaves no doubt as to the intention of France to march through Belgian territory against Germany.

The German Government cannot but fear that Belgium, in spite of the utmost good-will, will be unable, without assistance, to repel so considerable a French invasion with sufficient prospect of success to afford an adequate guarantee against danger to Germany. It is essential for the self-defense of Germany that she should anticipate any such hostile attack. The German Government would, however, feel the deepest regret if Belgium regarded as an act of hostility against herself the fact that the measures of Germany's opponents force Germany, for her own protection, to enter Belgian territory.

In order to exclude any possibility of misunderstanding, the German Government makes the following declaration:

1. Germany has in view no act of hostility against Belgium. In the event of Belgium being prepared in the coming war to maintain an attitude of friendly neutrality towards Germany, the German Government binds itself, at the conclusion of peace, to guarantee the possessions and independence of the Belgian Kingdom in full.

2. Germany undertakes, under the above-mentioned condition, to evacuate Belgian territory on the conclusion of peace.

3. If Belgium adopts a friendly attitude, Germany is prepared, in coöperation with the Belgian authorities, to purchase all necessaries for her troops against a cash payment, and to pay an indemnity for any damage that may have been caused by German troops.

4. Should Belgium oppose the German troops, and in particular should she throw difficulties in the way of their march by resistance of the fortresses on the Meuse, or by destroying railways, roads, tunnels, or other similar works, Germany will, to her regret, be compelled to consider Belgium as an enemy.

In this event, Germany can undertake no obligations towards Belgium, but the eventual adjustment of the relations between the two states must be left to the decision of arms.

The German Government, however, entertains the distinct hope that this eventuality will not occur, and that the Belgian Government will know how to take the necessary measures to prevent the occurrence of incidents such as those mentioned. In this case the friendly ties which bind the two neighboring states will grow stronger and more enduring.

In all my study of diplomatic documents, I have seen none so brutal as this note. It goes far beyond the Austrian note to Servia that caused the war. Belgium was forbidden to defend herself. Such defensive measures as the destruction of bridges, tunnels, roads, etc., are specifically forbidden.

These are the agreements of all nations as to neutral territory: —

1. The territory of neutral powers is inviolable.
2. Belligerents are forbidden to move troops or convoys of either munitions of war or supplies across the territory of a neutral power.

10. The fact of a neutral power resisting, even by force, attempts to violate its neutrality cannot be regarded as a hostile act.

One must render homage to the reply of the Belgian Government to the peremptory demand of Germany. Here it is in full: —

Note communicated by M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Herr von Below Saleske, German Minister

Brussels, August 3, 1914 (7 A.M.).

The German Government stated in their note of the 2d August, 1914, that according to reliable information French forces intended to march on the Meuse via Givet, and Namur, and that Belgium, in spite of the best intentions, would not be in a position to repulse, without assistance, an advance of French troops.

The German Government, therefore, considered themselves compelled to anticipate this attack and to violate Belgian territory. In these circumstances, Germany proposed to the Belgian Government to adopt a friendly attitude towards her, and undertook, on the conclusion of peace, to guarantee the integrity of the Kingdom and its possessions to their full extent. The note added that if Belgium put difficulties in the way of the advance of German troops, Germany would be compelled to consider her as an enemy, and to leave the ultimate adjustment of the relations between the two States to the decision of arms.

This note has made a deep and painful impression upon the Belgian Government.

The intentions attributed to France by Germany are in contradiction to the formal declarations made to us on August 1, in the name of the French Government.

Moreover, if, contrary to our expectation, Belgian neutrality should be violated by France, Belgium intends to fulfill her international obligations and the Belgian army would offer the most vigorous resistance to the invader.

The treaties of 1839, confirmed by the treaties of 1870, vouch for the independence and neutrality of Belgium under the guarantee of the powers, and notably of the Government of His Majesty the King of Prussia.

Belgium has always been faithful to her international obligations, she has carried out her duties in a spirit of loyal impartiality, and she has left nothing undone to maintain and enforce respect for her neutrality.

The attack upon her independence with which the German Government threaten her constitutes a flagrant violation of international law. No strategic interest justifies such a violation of law.

The Belgian Government, if they were to accept the proposals submitted to them, would sacrifice the honor of the nation and betray their duty towards Europe.

Conscious of the part which Belgium has played for more than eighty years in the civilization of the world, they refuse to believe that the independence of Belgium can only be preserved at the price of the violation of her neutrality.

If this hope is disappointed the Belgian Government are firmly resolved to repel, by all the means in their power, every attack upon their rights.

On the 3d of August the Belgian Government showed its very correct attitude by asking the *diplomatic* help of Great Britain, as is seen in the appeal from King Albert to King George. This is the King's appeal: —

His Majesty the King of the Belgians to His Majesty King George

(Telegram.)

Brussels, August 3, 1914.

Remembering the numerous proofs of Your Majesty's friendship and that of your predecessor, and the friendly attitude of England in 1870 and the proof of friendship you have just given us again, I make a supreme appeal to the diplomatic intervention of Your Majesty's Government to safeguard the integrity of Belgium.

Finally, on August 4, Belgium, having been invaded, appeals to the guarantors in the following dispatch: —

M. Davignon, Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, to British, French, and Russian Ministers at Brussels

Brussels, August 4, 1914.

Sir, —

The Belgian Government regret to have to announce to Your Excellency that this morning the armed forces of Germany entered Belgian territory in violation of treaty engagements.

The Belgian Government are firmly determined to resist by all the means in their power.

Belgium appeals to Great Britain, France, and Russia to coöperate as guaranteeing powers in the defense of her territory.

There should be concerted and joint action, to oppose the forcible measures taken by Germany against Belgium, and at the same time, to guarantee the future maintenance of the independence and integrity of Belgium.

Belgium is happy to be able to declare that she will undertake the defense of her fortified places.

Let us now consider Germany's course. When asked by the British Government on July 31, 1914, the reply was as follows: —

From Sir Edward Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin, to Sir Edward Grey

(Telegraphic.) *Berlin, July 31, 1914.*

Neutrality of Belgium, referred to in your telegram of 31st July to Sir F. Bertie.

I have seen Secretary of State, who informs me that he must consult the Emperor and the Chancellor before he could possibly answer. I gathered from what he said that he thought any reply they might give could not but disclose a certain amount of their plan of campaign in the event of

war ensuing, and he was therefore very doubtful whether they would return any answer at all. His Excellency, nevertheless, took note of your request.

In 1911, Von Bethmann-Hollweg refused to make a public assurance to Belgium as to Germany's intentions in case of war, on the ground that it might reveal the German plan of campaign. He, however, assured the Belgian Government privately that Germany would not violate her neutrality.

Two points here are worth considering; first, that Germany was willing to take advantage to herself by the threat of committing a great crime, and secondly, that the Belgian Government was certainly not pro-English in accepting this private promise.

Baron Beyens, in "Germany Before the War," says: —

Very vague, too, was the language used by Herr von Kiderlen-Wächter in 1912. Scarcely had I taken up my post in Berlin before he complained to me about the excitement shown in Belgium during the Agadir crisis. As a mere measure of precaution, we had put our fortresses into a state of defense. "There was no reason," the Foreign Secretary observed to me, "to fear that Germany would violate your neutrality or that of your Dutch neighbors." Fine words, but nothing more!

A year later, on April 29, 1913, Herr von Jagow, urged by a Socialist, at a Reichstag Committee, to explain himself on the subject of Belgian neutrality, curtly replied that this question was determined by international agreements, and that Germany would respect those agreements. He obstinately refused to say any more to another Socialist member, who was not satisfied with this summary answer.

Evidently the German Government had been considering the invasion of Belgium, since as early as

August 1, 1914, Prince Lichnowsky, the German Ambassador in London, asked Sir Edward Grey if England would remain neutral if Germany promised not to violate the neutrality of Belgium.

As to Germany's allegations in regard to France's plans for violating Belgian neutrality, the French course of campaign at the outbreak of the war does not justify such a statement. France had massed her troops opposite the German frontier, and when the German forces swarmed through Belgium, she was obliged to rush troops to meet the invasion from that quarter. An immense number of railway trains was pressed into service for this purpose, and there was great danger of the communications being cut. As it was, France was able to make but slight resistance. Considering the splendid railway service that Germany possessed, enabling her to throw her troops on the Belgian frontier, it would seem that France could hardly have contemplated invading Germany through Belgium. And in fact she did not send sufficient troops even to protect her own Belgian frontier, much less enough to enable her to take the offensive through Belgium. It was three weeks before France was able to rearrange her plan of campaign so as to meet the German armies.

The German Government has thus far produced no proof that either France or Belgium violated the latter's neutrality.

The German plan of campaign was simple, and had been concealed so thoroughly that the concealment constitutes an extraordinary achievement. Germany's plan was to contain the French armies on the French frontier, and rush her main forces through Belgium

and Luxemburg, make a gigantic enveloping movement, surround the French armies and cut off their supplies, and thus achieve a second Sedan on a gigantic scale.

Sir Edward Goschen, the British Ambassador at Berlin, was told by Von Jagow, Secretary of State, on August 1: —

Russia had said that her mobilization did not necessarily imply war, and that she could perfectly well remain mobilized for months without making war. This was not the case with Germany. She had the speed and Russia had the numbers, and the safety of the German Empire forbade that Germany should allow Russia time to bring up masses of troops from all parts of her wide dominions.

And on August 4, Von Jagow said: —

They had to advance into France by the quickest and easiest way, so as to be able to get well ahead with their operations and endeavor to strike some decisive blow as early as possible. It was a matter of life and death for them, as, if they had gone by the more southern route, they could not have hoped, in view of the paucity of roads and the strength of the fortresses, to get through without formidable opposition entailing great loss of time. This loss of time would have meant time gained by the Russians for bringing up their troops to the German frontier. Rapidity of action was the great German asset, while that of Russia was an inexhaustible supply of troops.

On the same day at six o'clock in the morning, the German Minister at Brussels made the following communication to M. Davignon: —

In accordance with my instructions, I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that in consequence of the refusal of the Belgian Government to entertain the well-intentioned proposals made to it by the German Government, the latter,

to its deep regret, finds itself compelled to take — if necessary by force of arms — those measures of defense already designated as indispensable, in view of the menace of France.

This meant war, and the German Minister to Belgium received his passports.

King Albert's address to the Belgian Parliament on August 4, is as follows: —

Never since 1830 has a graver hour sounded for Belgium. The force of our right and the necessity for Europe of our autonomous existence make us still hope that the events which we fear will not take place; but if it is necessary to resist the invasion of our soil, duty will find us armed and decided upon the greatest sacrifices!

From this moment our youth will have risen to defend our fatherland against the danger. A single duty is imposed on our will: a determined resistance, courage, and unity.

Our enthusiasm is shown by our irreproachable mobilization and by the multitude of our volunteers.

The moment for action is here. I have called you together to allow the Chambers to associate themselves in the enthusiasm of the country. You will find a way to pass all these measures at once. You are all decided to preserve intact the sacred patrimony of our ancestors. No one will fail in his duty.

The army is equal to its task. The Government and myself have full confidence. The Government understands its responsibilities and will maintain them till the end to safeguard the supreme good of the country. If the stranger violates our territory, he will find all Belgians gathered round their Sovereign, who will never betray his constitutional oath.

I have faith in our destinies. A country which defends itself imposes respect on all and does not perish. God will be with us.

I envy no one who can read these simple, heroic words without emotion. I hope that the youth of

generations yet unborn may decide when they read history that the King of the Belgians was most to be envied of the kings and emperors of the Great War.

On August 5, M. Davignon sent to the Belgian Foreign Ministers in all lands this dispatch:—

By the treaty of April 19, 1839, Prussia, France, Great Britain, Austria, and Russia declared themselves guarantors of the treaty concluded on the same day between His Majesty the King of the Belgians and His Majesty the King of the Netherlands. The treaty reads "Belgium shall form an independent and perpetually neutral State." Belgium has fulfilled all her international obligations; she has accomplished her duty in a spirit of loyal impartiality; she has neglected no effort to maintain her neutrality and to cause that neutrality to be respected.

In these circumstances the Belgian Government has learned with deep pain that the armed forces of Germany, a Power guaranteeing Belgian neutrality, have entered Belgian territory in violation of the obligations undertaken by treaty.

It is our duty to protest with indignation against an outrage against international law provoked by no act of ours.

The Royal Government is firmly determined to repel by all the means in its power the attack thus made upon its neutrality, and it recalls the fact that, in virtue of Article 10 of the Hague Convention of 1907 respecting the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in the case of war by land, if a neutral power repels, even by force, attacks on her neutrality, such action cannot be considered as a hostile act.

V. Statements of Baron Beyens, Belgian Minister at Berlin

I will add to the story of the documents the souvenirs of Baron Beyens, who tells first of the relations of the courts of Germany and Belgium, and then gives a vivid picture of the terrible days just before Belgium

was invaded. In his book, "Germany Before the War," Baron Beyens writes: —

When the negotiations skillfully conducted at the opening of the new reign for the fixing of the boundary between the Congo and German East Africa were nearing their end, our young Sovereign wished to give the Emperor a token of his personal feelings, and of his sincere wish to keep up good relations with Germany in Africa as well as in Europe. Together with the Queen, he paid him an official visit at the close of 1910. I was in Their Majesties' suite. Their reception at Potsdam was very cordial and of an almost intimate character, apart from the two customary spring parades, which our Sovereigns attended, and the military banquets that followed. Unfortunately, a slight illness of the Emperor's robbed this visit of its chief attraction for spectators who, like myself, were eager to note the expression of the Imperial mask.

At the Court dinner the Crown Prince read the speech prepared by his father, and bade the royal pair welcome. The most salient passages were those alluding to the wedded bliss that a princess of a German house had brought to our King, and recalling the ties of blood between the two families, besides the historical memories that linked the two countries. King Albert, in his reply, above all praised the Emperor as a man of peace, who had devoted his life to securing the welfare of his subjects and the economic advance of Germany.

The German Sovereigns did not wait until the following year before returning the visit. They came to Brussels at the end of October, accompanied by their daughter. The presence of the young princess bore further witness to their genuine friendship with King Albert and Queen Elizabeth. William II, both in his official after-dinner speeches and his private conversations, declared himself deeply touched by the welcome that he had received. His heart warmed to the Belgian people, and he was delighted at their successes in the sphere of industry and commerce, as revealed in striking fashion at the Brussels International Exhibition. Jovial,

affable, enthusiastic in turn, and constantly breaking into his guttural laugh, he ran up and down the whole gamut of his nature. His hearers were spellbound. How could they have failed to be convinced that the great Emperor in their midst was a benevolent Titan?

Obvious attempts to gain for Germany the favor of the Belgian Court and society, amazement at our prosperity — such were the impressions left upon us by the mobile face and winning smile of our august visitor. Brussels, unused to receiving royal personages, had spared no effort in order to rise to the occasion.

When the Emperor, from the balcony of the Town Hall, had feasted his eyes on the incomparable scene of the market-place, he exclaimed to the Empress: "We did not expect anything so beautiful!" While on his way back from a drive to Tervueren[1] on the magnificent road constructed by the late King, he expressed his astonishment at the number of sumptuous villas along the way, and estimated the incomes of their owners. . . .

Early hints of war

After Agadir, William II came to regard war with France as inexorably decreed by Fate.

On the 5th and 6th of November, 1913, the King of the Belgians was his (the Kaiser's) guest at Potsdam, after returning from Lüneburg, where he had paid his usual courtesy visit to the regiment of dragoons of which he was honorary colonel. On this occasion the Emperor told King Albert that he looked upon war with France as "inevitable and close at hand." What reason did he give for this pessimistic statement, which impressed his royal visitor all the more strongly since the belief in the peaceful sentiments of the Emperor had not yet been shaken in Belgium? He

[1] It will be noticed in the extracts from the Dutch Professor Grondys, in the chapter on the alleged atrocities in Belgium, that it was at Tervueren that the young Jesuit father was executed for referring in an uncomplimentary manner in his notebook to the destruction of the Library of Louvain.

pointed out that France herself wanted war, and that she was arming rapidly with that end in view, as was proved by the vote on the law enacting a three years' term of military service. At the same time he declared that he felt certain of victory. The Belgian monarch, who was better informed as to the real inclinations of the French Government and people, tried in vain to enlighten him, and to dispel from his mind the false picture that he drew from the language of a handful of fanatical patriots, the picture of a France thirsting for war.

The real object of these confidential outbursts is not hard to discover. They were an invitation to our country, face to face with the danger that threatened Western Europe, to throw herself into the arms of the stronger, arms ready to open, to clasp Belgium, — yes, and to crush her. When we think of the ultimatum issued to Belgium on the following 2d of August, we realize to what an act of servility and cowardice William II, through this Potsdam interview, would fain have driven King Albert.

On the 6th of November General von Moltke, Chief of the General Staff, after a dinner to which the Emperor, in honor of his guest, had invited the leading officials present in Berlin, had a conversation with King Albert. He expressed himself in the same terms as his Sovereign on the subject of war with France, asserted that it was bound to come soon, and insisted still more emphatically on the certain prospect of success, in view of the enthusiasm with which the whole German nation would gird up its loins to beat back the traditional foe.

General von Moltke also said to the Belgian Military Attaché: "War with France at an early date is inevitable, and the victory of the German army is certain, even if it is purchased by tremendous sacrifices and by a few preliminary set-backs. Nothing can stop the *furor teutonicus* once it has been let loose. The German nation will rise as one man to take up the gauntlet which the French people will have the insane foolhardiness to throw down."

The introduction of universal service in Belgium was not looked upon with favor in Germany. As a matter of fact, the

Emperor ought to have been delighted. During his visit to Switzerland in the previous autumn, he had complained of the exposed state of his northwestern frontier, as contrasted with the solid rampart provided in the south by the excellent troops of the Swiss Confederation. The German newspapers spoke of our military reforms without any malicious comments, but the same cannot be said of the German officer class. I was able to gather this from the remarks made to me by Baron von Zedlitz, colonel of a dragoon regiment of the Guards, and grandson, on his mother's side, of a former Belgian Minister at Berlin. No doubt the Belgian sympathies that he had inherited from his mother moved him to unbosom himself to me one day. "What is the good," he said, "of enlarging the number of your troops? With the small number that you had before, you surely never dreamt of barring the way to us in a Franco-German war. The increase of your effectives might inspire you with the idea of resisting us. If a single shot were fired on us, Heaven knows what would become of Belgium!" This was the language of a friend, not of a soldier.

The passage of the belligerents through Belgium was a favorite theme with all writers, French, German, English, Dutch, and Belgian, who handled, more or less competently, the problem of the coming war. Some of Germany's preparations for invading her neighbors could not be hidden, and these naturally gave a fillip to the discussion of various moot points. As early as 1911, ten railway lines, both single and double, ran from the Eifel region to the Belgian frontier or the Duchy of Luxemburg. Four others were under construction, and yet another four were projected. Most of these lines were quite needless for the purposes of traffic, and their aim was purely strategic. Stations with full plant and special platforms for the arrival and departure of troops had been built with that methodical thoroughness for which the Germans are famous. An enormous concentration camp, with a range for artillery practice, had been established at Elsenborn, near Malmédy, a stone's throw from our frontier. Which route would be chosen by the oncoming host?

So far, we had no cause for doubting that our frontiers

were impregnable, still less that they were capable of resisting. The progress of ballistics in Germany and Austria, the terrible results gained by unremitting toil in the workshops of Krupp and Skoda, were still unknown to the outside world. No one suspected the existence of German seventeen-inch and Austrian twelve-inch mortars, which would shatter a fort of concrete and steel in a few hours under a fire of projectiles weighing nearly a ton.

Some writers limited the German march to the right bank of the Meuse, across Belgian Luxemburg, despite the scarcity of roads and the obstacles that the broken nature of the country would offer to a rapid onset. Belgian Luxemburg, an outlying spur of our territory in the Ardennes district, seemed impossible for a Belgian force to defend.

Other military prophets, such as General Dejardin in Belgium and General Maitrot in France held that the enemy would operate mainly in great masses on the left bank of the Meuse.

In point of fact, however, the plan of the German Staff had not been fathomed. Among those who could speak with authority, the greater number imagined that only the right wing of the army directed against France would pass through Belgium. They had not guessed the bold maneuver, the tremendous developments, that we have seen carried out: to leave a "curtain" of troops along the Vosges line, and with three fourths of the army to cross the Meuse at several points, from Visé right down to Dinant; to take Liège and Namur by storm, if necessary; to march on Brussels, sweeping aside the Belgian army; and thence to turn off southwards by the various routes that lead to Paris. The whole northwestern section of France was unprovided with defenses, excepting the fortress of Maubeuge. Once the plains of Belgium had been traversed, the road to Paris would be open.

The reader must picture to himself not a stream or a torrent, but a veritable sea of men, inundating our country from Holland to Luxemburg, a million and a half to two million soldiers! The defensive plans of Germany's opponents had not allowed for the inrush of such an avalanche

through Belgium. At the outset of the war, according to an official Note issued by the Republican Government, the whole of the French forces were disposed over against the German border, from Belfort to the Belgian frontier.

The days just before the invasion

The Brussels Cabinet did not know, any more than I did, of the bargaining which the German Government had attempted in order to wrest from England a promise that she would remain neutral. First it was France's turn to be chaffered over; then came Belgium. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, in his interview of 29th July with Sir Edward Goschen, had confined himself to stating that our country would suffer no loss of territory, provided it did not take sides against Germany. He gave no guarantee as to our independence. This engagement would be enough, he fancied, to make the English, who were reluctant to face the hazards of a Continental war, maintain the rôle of impartial onlookers, since they would not have to fear either the dismemberment of France or the disappearance of the little Belgian Kingdom. Nevertheless, on the morning of 4th August, when the Chancellor learned that Belgium was girding herself for a vigorous resistance, he grasped the necessity for calming London's excitement by a notable advance on his former bid. He telegraphed to the German Ambassador, ordering him to tell Sir Edward Grey as soon as possible that under no pretense whatever would Germany annex Belgian territory. On the afternoon of the same day, growing uneasy at England's silence, he repeated to the Reichstag, with an addition, the guarantee he had proffered to Sir Edward Grey: "So long as Great Britain remains neutral, we shall respect the integrity and independence of Belgium."

It was too late. An irretrievable blunder had been committed on the evening of 2d August; namely, the dispatch of a highly confidential Note, the most brutal of ultimatums, to the Belgian Foreign Minister. Not a word was said in this document of the 1839 treaties or of Belgian neutrality,

beyond a vague hint that France was about to make use of Belgian territory in her advance against Germany, a proceeding that compelled the latter to come to our aid. Then various baits are held out to Belgium, if she will desert her trust as a neutral. By a diplomatic euphemism, the cowardly act demanded of her is cloaked under the name of "benevolent neutrality." The integrity and independence of the kingdom will be respected to the full (nothing is said explicitly about the Congo), her territory will be evacuated after the conclusion of peace, the German troops will pay cash down for all that they require, and an indemnity will be granted for any damage that they may cause. The sting is in the tail; the threats are reserved for the end. If any armed resistance is offered, if any obstacles are placed in the way of the German march, if any roads, railways, or works of art are destroyed, Belgium will be treated as an enemy. This one word reveals our doom.

I learned on 2d August, from our Military Attaché (who had the news from an officer of the Emperor's household), that the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg had been occupied. The route followed by the German army left me no doubt as to the coming invasion of Belgian Luxemburg, and I telegraphed this pessimistic forecast to my Government. Yet I had not gauged the full measure of the disaster that was about to overtake my country. On the evening of Monday, 3d August, I received the official telegram informing me of the German ultimatum and of our reply. At first I was dumfounded; then came a fierce glow of indignation. I tried to betray no sign of this to my young secretaries, in order that their sorrow and their anger might not be needlessly increased. I spent a part of the night in reflecting on the questions that I would put to the Foreign Secretary at the earliest opportunity. I felt it my bounden duty to go to him and insist upon a downright explanation of the nameless act perpetrated by the German Government.

The readiness with which Herr von Jagow let me know that he hoped to see me at the Foreign Office on Tuesday morning proved that he was no less impatient than I to have

this decisive interview. When I arrived, at nine o'clock, the Foreign Secretary was already at work in his room.

Before many words had passed between us, I saw that we were speaking two different languages, and that neither could understand the other's tongue. I invoked Belgium's honor, the honor that is no less sacred to a nation than to an individual; her obligations as a neutral, her past conduct, always thoroughly loyal towards Germany (this the Secretary of State ungrudgingly admitted), and her inability to answer the Imperial Government's proposal in any other way than she had answered it already.

Baron Beyens refers the reader to a report of this conversation by his fellow countryman, M. Waxweiler, in "La Belgique Neutre." I reproduce this conversation: —

The Belgian Minister had scarcely pronounced his greetings when Herr von Jagow exclaimed: —

> "Believe me, it is with anguish in her heart that Germany has resolved to violate Belgian neutrality; and personally I feel the most poignant regret. But what else is possible? It is a question of life or death for the Empire. If the German armies would avoid being caught between hammer and anvil, they must strike a vigorous blow upon the side of France so as to be able to turn then upon Russia."
>
> "But," said Baron Beyens, "the French frontier is of such an extent as to make passage through Belgium avoidable."
>
> "But that frontier is too well fortified. Besides, what is it we ask of you? Simply to permit us a free passage and not to destroy your railways or your tunnels, and to allow us to occupy the fortified places which we need."
>
> "There is," immediately rejoined the Belgian Minister, "a very easy way of formulating the only reply admissible to such a demand. It is this: Suppose

France had preferred the selfsame request and we had yielded. Would not Germany have said that we had basely betrayed her?"

The Secretary of State allowing this clear-cut interrogation to pass without answer, Baron Beyens completed his thought.

"Have you," he asked, "the least thing with which to reproach us? Have we not always, for three quarters of a century, fulfilled toward Germany, as well as to all the great powers guarantors [of the neutrality of Belgium], all our duties of neutrality? Have we not given Germany proof of our loyal friendship? With what coin does Germany repay all this? With making Belgium the battle-field of Europe, and we know what devastation, what calamity modern warfare brings in its train."

"Germany has nothing with which she can reproach Belgium; the attitude of Belgium has always been beyond reproach (*d'une correction parfaite*)," admitted Herr von Jagow.

"You will admit," replied Baron Beyens, "that Belgium can make no other reply than that which she has already given, without the loss of honor. It is with nations as it is with individuals; there is not a different kind of honor for a people than for one's self. You must admit," urged Baron Beyens, "our reply had to be what it is."

"I grant you that as a private individual, but as Secretary of State I have no opinion to express."

When I announced my intention of leaving Berlin and of demanding my passports, he remonstrated: he did not want to break off relations with me! What had he expected from this interview, and what did he expect now?

As I withdrew, I shot the Parthian arrow that I had kept in reserve: the violation of Belgian neutrality would mean for Germany a war with England. Herr von Jagow had been speaking with emotion, in an earnest tone, which he tried

to make persuasive; but at this he merely shrugged his shoulders.

During the afternoon the Emperor's speech in the Reichstag exhorted the nation's delegates to help in carrying to a triumphant issue this war that had been forced upon Germany! William II said nothing about the violation of Belgium, but called down upon his arms the blessing of the Most High, his wonted confidant.

The next speaker was the Chancellor. More honest than he has been since then, he unhesitatingly confessed the wrong that had been done to Belgium, and promised to make amends so soon as the military aim should have been attained.

I had not been at fault, however, in predicting to Herr von Jagow a war with England. That same evening I dined alone at the Kaiserhof, a prey to gloomiest forebodings. As I left the restaurant, a handful of papers were flung to me from a "Berliner Tageblatt" motor-car. Marveling at the swift fulfillment of my prophecy, I read that Great Britain had declared war on Germany, and that her Ambassador, a few hours earlier, had handed in an ultimatum to the Imperial Government. I at once bethought myself of rushing to the British Embassy, in order to obtain some further details of this wonderful news. Was it thus that Heaven answered the appeals of her favorite?

Round about that part of the Wilhelmstrasse in which the British Embassy is situated a large crowd had forgathered. Respectably dressed citizens of both sexes were bellowing out, with frantic enthusiasm, their best-loved hymn, "Deutschland über Alles." The national anthem was succeeded by a volley of cat-calls, after which came a shower of missiles — brickbats and lumps of coal. The ground-floor windows of the Embassy were shivered to atoms, the two policemen posted on either side of the door making no attempt to interfere. I had seen and heard enough. As I was wending my way homewards, a gleam of hope stole into my heart amid all its grief and anguish. I saw a terrible face rising above the blood-red horizon — the face of the British Nemesis.

VI. Germany's Charges at the Beginning of the War

In a document published September, 1914, signed by Prince von Bülow, Dr. von Schmoller, Professor Rohrbach, Dr. Jaeckh, Dr. Kaempf, President of the Reichstag, Count Reventlow, Dr. Rathenau, General von der Goltz, Herr von Gwinner, head of the Deutsche Bank, Herr Ballin, head of the Hamburg-American Line, and many other leading men, appear the following statements: —

Before one German soldier had crossed the German frontier, a large number of French aeroplanes came flying into our country across the neutral territory of Belgium and Luxemburg without a word of warning on the part of the Belgian Government. At the same time the German Government learned that the French were about to enter Belgium. Then our Government with great reluctance had to decide upon requesting the Belgian Government to allow our troops to march through its territory. Belgium was to be indemnified after the war, was to retain its sovereignty and integrity. Belgium protested, at the same time allowing, by an agreement with France, that the French troops might enter Belgium. After all this, and not till France and Belgium itself had broken the neutrality, our troops entered the neutral territory. Germany wanted nothing from Belgium, but had to prevent Belgian soil from being used as a gate of entrance into German territory.

Great Britain asked in return for its neutrality that the German forces should not enter Belgium. In other words, it asked that Germany should allow the French and Belgian troops to form on Belgian territory for a march against our frontier. This we could not allow. It would have been suicidal.

The German troops, with their iron discipline, will respect the personal liberty and property of the individual in Belgium, just as they did in France in 1870.

The Belgians would have been wise if they had permitted the passage of the German troops. They would have preserved their integrity, and besides that, would have fared well from the business point of view, for the army would have proved a good customer and paid cash.

Now, it may be said that such men would not sign these statements unless they believed them, and further it may be said that they express the fundamental convictions of the German people.

How can we account for such confusion of thought? Great Britain never asked, in return for neutrality, that German forces should not enter Belgium.

How can we account for such a group of men suggesting that Belgium should sell her honor for cash?

How can we account for the assertion that the German Government learned that the French were about to enter Belgium, when nearly all France's armies were opposite the German frontier? There has been no proof of French aeroplanes flying over Belgium and Luxemburg. If there had been, this would have been a just cause for remonstrance, not invasion.

An investigation was made by two distinguished French professors as to these allegations, who write in part: —

As we wished to ascertain whether the German newspapers had given a more detailed account of these occurrences, we consulted five of the principal newspapers ("Vorwaerts," "Arbeiter Zeitung" of Vienna, "Frankfurter Zeitung," "Kölnische Zeitung," "Münchner Neueste Nachrichten") from the end of July to the 5th of August. First of all we noticed that the aviator who is said to have flown over Karlsruhe is not mentioned. As for the others, the account of them is as vague as it is in the official note. These incidents, given as the cause determining war, take

up one line, two or three at the most. The bombs never left any trace. One of these aeroplanes, that at Wesel, is said to have been brought down; nothing is said of the aviator and what became of him, nor is there anything about the aeroplane itself. In a word, the Germans took care to draw attention to their arrival in Germany and then never spoke of them again. They were never seen to return to their starting-point.

But we have still more convincing evidence. We have been able to procure a Nuremberg newspaper, the "Frankischer Kurrier." On the 2d of August, the day the bombs are supposed to have been thrown, not a word is said about the incident. Nuremberg received the news on the 3d by a telegram from Berlin identical to that published by the other newspapers. Again, the "Kölnische Zeitung" of the 3d, in its morning edition, published a telegram from Munich which read as follows: "The Bavarian Minister of War is doubtful as to the exactness of the news announcing that aviators had been seen above the lines Nuremberg-Kitzingen and Nuremberg-Anspach and that they had thrown bombs on the railway."

Up to the present time the German Government has produced no proof of aggression by France. I give certain orders by the French military authorities that indicate the course of France, and also, incidentally, that of Belgium: —

General secret instructions for covering troops

Issued at Paris, August 2, 1914.

(1) From information received it appears that the Germans have this morning violated the French frontier at three points, namely, between Delle and Belfort, opposite Cirey-sur-Vezouze, and both to the north and south of Longwy.

Under these circumstances, the order forbidding the passage of troops eastwards beyond the line laid down by tele-

gram No. 129 — 3/11 T, situated generally at a distance of 10 kilometres from the frontier, is hereby rescinded. Nevertheless, for national reasons of a moral kind and for most important reasons of diplomacy, it is absolutely necessary to leave to the Germans all responsibility for hostilities. Therefore, until further orders, covering troops will confine themselves to driving back attacking forces beyond the frontier without pursuing them and without penetrating into the territory of the enemy.

(2) The Commander-in-Chief intends to take up the general offensive only when his forces have been concentrated.

(Signed) J. JOFFRE,
General Commander-in-Chief.

Message telephoned to the officers in command of sections of covering troops

Paris, August 3, 10.30 A.M.

The first paragraph of the General Instructions for covering troops, issued yesterday, the 2d of August, at 5.30 P.M., laid stress upon the urgent necessity of not crossing the frontier for reasons therein specified. If any incidents should occur, they must only take place and be developed on French territory. This order will be confirmed to you by an officer of the Grand General Staff, who will go to see you this evening by motor-car.

(Signed) J. JOFFRE,
The General Commander-in-Chief.

Telegrams sent to the Second, Sixth, Seventh, Twentieth, and Twenty-first Corps

August 4, 1914, 10.40 A.M.

War is declared.

Italy has made an official declaration of complete neutrality. Germany will endeavor, by the dissemination of false news, to induce us to violate the neutrality of Belgium and Switzerland. It is strictly forbidden, in the most formal manner, until the issue of new orders, to the contrary, that

any of our troops should penetrate, either as patrols or single scouts, into Swiss or Belgian territory, or that any airman should fly over the territories of these countries.

(Signed) MESSIMY.

Instructions issued in common to the Cavalry Corps and to the Second Corps

Paris, August 5, 7.20 and 7.45 A.M.

(1) French aeroplanes and dirigibles are authorized to fly over Belgian territory. But as the Belgian troops were yesterday still under orders to fire upon all airships, and as the countermanding order may not as yet have reached everybody, it will be necessary for our pilots to fly at a considerable height.

(2) Cavalry patrols for reconnaissance work are also authorized to penetrate into Belgian territory, but for the present they must not be supported by any large bodies of troops. Your object from now onwards should be to act upon this authority with discretion, so as to cut the lines of communication as near to the frontier of Luxemburg as possible — that is to say, the roads leading westwards from in front of Virton-Stavelot.

(3) Express orders must be issued to the troops to regard themselves as being in the country of a friend and ally; to make no requisitions until the convention, now under discussion, on this subject has been made known, and to buy nothing except by friendly agreement and for ready cash.

J. JOFFRE,
The General Commander-in-Chief.

VII. THE INNOCENCE OF BELGIUM

To understand the German belief in regard to the neutrality of Belgium it is necessary to know the general beliefs in Germany as to the character and aims of England. These I have illustrated by quotations in this book. Then we must add to this a state of mind that

in an individual would be called the mania of persecution.

The German people are absolutely convinced that Belgium was one of the conspiring enemies that united to destroy Germany. A careful study of the documents, collateral material, and the actual facts, aside from the printed words, show that these charges are absolutely without foundation.

It also seems probable that the German war plans involved the invasion of France by way of Belgium, but I believe that Germany did not anticipate such resistance on the part of Belgium, and that when Germany made the second offer to Belgium after the fall of Liège she expected the acquiescence of Belgium.

The "Deutsche Kriege Zeitung," official paper of the German Military Association, says (War Edition):

> The plan for the invasion of France had been prepared years ago. It had to be pursued successfully on the northern part of France through Belgium, so as to avoid the strongly fortified lines with which the enemy had protected her German frontier, and which it would have been very difficult to pierce.

As to Germany's strategic railways, I give this statement of Walter Littlefield: —

> The strategic dispositions of Germany, especially as regards railways, have for some years given rise to the apprehension that Germany would attack France through Belgium. The disposition of the Third, Seventh, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Germany Army Corps and the First, Fourth, and Fifth Cavalry Divisions, from August 2 to 5, shown on French war maps, reveals that the attack was so made.

Stewart Houston Chamberlain makes a similar statement: —

The German victories are not, in the first place, due to the "*furor teutonicus*" of which one hears so much; on the contrary, they are mainly based on the calm, efficient, and foreseeing work of decades. By well-informed quarters I am told that the whole of the present plan of campaign dates in its very details back to old Moltke; he had drawn up a plan for a war on two as well as on three fronts. This plan has been kept up-to-date by the indefatigable labors of the General Staff — new means of transport, auto-transport, aeronautics, the new arms, have all been taken into consideration, and the plan extended; in addition it has been nearly daily tested as to its readiness. . . .

Belgium was expected to submit under terrorization. The German documents prove this, but if there is one lesson taught by the war, it is this: that threats, coercion, terrorization, do not make people yield. Illustrations are the failure of Austria to coerce Servia, and of Germany and Austria to coerce Russia, and the failure of Germany to coerce Belgium, and the failure of Germany to coerce Turkey in regard to the Armenian massacres. Sir Edward Grey, carrying on his efforts for peace during the fateful thirteen days, without threats or attempts to coerce, showed a much better understanding of human psychology.

Excepting the German official Zeppelin reports I have examined no body of material so utterly detached from reality as the various and varying charges, made by the German Government and German publicists and professors, against Belgium.

The German Government largely depends for its information in regard to such matters on the military authorities. The military authorities depend on their Intelligence Department.

Judging by the reports made by the Intelligence

Department as to the Zeppelin raids, and as to the acts of France and Belgium at the opening of the war, I believe that the Intelligence Department is very badly informed, and it is well to remember that the reasons assigned by the military authorities that led to the declaration of war against Russia, depended on information furnished by this same Intelligence Department.

CHAPTER XV

THE GERMAN THEORIES AND PRACTICE OF DEPORTATIONS AND OF TERRITORIAL APPROPRIATION

I. The Origin of the Theories

The actually or potentially dominating nations of the twentieth century are the United States, the British Empire, Germany, and Russia. War and peace and the security of other nations are determined by the policies and acts of these four dominant powers. Of these four powers the United States and Russia possess in a very high degree the essential factor of natural safety. On the other hand, the British Empire and Germany lack the essential factor of natural safety. Hence the British Navy and the German Army.

Germany has two great lacks: territory and security. Russia, with one sixth of the earth's surface, larger than the United States, Canada, and Mexico combined, with two and one half times the population of Germany, and the highest birth-rate of any nation in the world, impends over Germany. This thought greatly preoccupies the minds of those charged with the safety of the Fatherland. It is the obsession of Germany.

For centuries Germany was merely a geographical name, designating many little nations, often mutually distrustful and hostile. For centuries also Germany was the battle-field of Europe. The wars of the nations were fought on her fields. The German Empire was conceived by the sword and born on the

battle-field. The most persistent tradition of Germany is war.

The nineteenth century is Germany's century. Under the spur of necessity she mastered more thoroughly than any other nation the inventions and discoveries of the last hundred years. These inventions and discoveries led to intensive internal development in all countries. The new body of knowledge revolutionized education, agriculture, hygiene and social and industrial organization.

Given other factors the basic force of a nation lies in the health and vigor of the people. In Germany physical training for the army both improves the health of the people and disciplines them. To overcome the inequalities and unhygienic condition of modern industrial life, Germany introduced government insurance and special care of working-men on a national scale.

Professor Fuster said years ago, before one could think of the war, that German social reform "had made Germany strong and full of life-force, to last forever."

I believe Professor Zimmermann has coined the saying: that German social policy has "contributed as much to the gigantic and victorious mobilization of the German nation as the General Staff, the Deutsche Bank, and the railway."

Poets, philosophers, statesmen, warriors, scientists, manufacturers, traders, master minds — all have worked together in Germany in the most harmonious and efficient coördination to create their ideal nation. Two things they could not change — their situation in the heart of Europe and the extent of their territory.

The extraordinary efficiency of the Germans, their enormously increased and rapidly growing population, and their intense sense of nationality caused in them

a passionate revolt against the limited extent of their contiguous territory, and against the natural insecurity of their empire. These factors led to the birth of a body of feelings and beliefs that ultimately affected the whole national mind. First there was a sense of great superiority over other nations, then a belief in the decadence of their rivals; and finally, a sense of exasperation that the world should be parceled out in such a manner as to give the most worthy nation territory of absolutely insignificant extent. If the population of the United States were 70,000,000 and confined to the State of California, we should probably regard South America with its 9,000,000 square miles and a population of 75,000,000 with an acquisitive mind.

II. The Mission of the German People and their Sense of Superiority

I can give a better idea of this sense of superiority in the German people by quoting from the recognized leaders of thought in Germany.

The mission of Germany as to universal peace

Baron von Stengel, Professor at Munich, who was one of the German delegates at the Hague Conference, accepting an invitation from the Anti-War League of Holland to give his opinion on the subject of a future peace conference, replied as follows: —

It would be completely superfluous to say, because it is beyond all doubt, that the final and decisive victory must rest and will rest with Germany. Then we shall be in a position to restrain all the enemies of peace, and to win and maintain permanent peace; the only peace that will be assured, alike for ourselves and for all civilized humanity.

The war has demonstrated, throughout its course, that we, the Germans, have been chosen by Providence, from among all earth's peoples, to put ourselves at the head of all civilized nations and guide them to a sure peace under our protection. For this we possess not only the necessary power and force, but also, in the highest degree, the intellectual gifts requisite, and we are the flower of the entire creation's *Kultur*. Consequently, it has been reserved for us to do what no nation hitherto has been able to do — to give all the world peace.

From this it follows that it is useless to engage in any labors on behalf of peace, because we, the Germans, with our domination over our turbulent neighbors, shall assume also the duty of policing peace. We shall be in a position to destroy in the germ all hostility to peace.

Subjection to our guardianship, which is in every sense superior to any other, is the sure and only road to prosperity for every nation, and especially for the neutrals. The best thing they can do is to unite voluntarily with us and rest on us. In these times, so difficult for those who are isolated, it is proper and prudent for them to unite themselves with one powerful head. To make one's self worthy of a powerful hereditary seigneur is to sow seed for the future. No people is richer in sentiment and in ideals than are we, the Germans. Therefore, under our protection, all international law is perfectly superfluous; for, by our own natural instinct, we give each his own.

Professor Rudolf Eucken, of the University of Jena, says: —

To us more than to any other nation is entrusted the true structure of human existence; as an intellectual people we have, irrespective of creeds, worked for soul depth in religion, for scientific thoroughness. . . . All this constitutes possessions the lack of which would make life and effort purposeless to mankind.

This war is not only a struggle between certain nations, but also between certain forms of culture. We are fighting for the maintenance and spreading of the special form of

culture which our nature has implanted and the whole course of our history has developed in us. . . .

Thus it is that we have raised religion, philosophy, education, music, and poetry to lofty heights. We have achieved such great things in the world because we put our soul into our work. Because we did not seek externals, but ourselves, in culture, it became for us a matter of deepest earnest. . . .

Mankind at this point needs German methods. However much our opponents may rail against us just now, they will eventually be forced to make use of us for their spiritual preservation.

Professor Östwald, a Nobel prize-winner (as a chemist) and a well-known German scientist, says: —

Germany, thanks to her genius for organization or social efficiency, has attained a stage of civilization far higher than that of all other peoples. This war will in the future compel these other peoples to participate, under the form of German social efficiency, in a civilization higher than their own. Among our enemies the Russians, in brief, are still in the period of the undisciplined tribe, while the French and the English have only attained the degree of cultural development which we ourselves left behind fifty years ago. Their stage of culture is that of individualism; but above that stage lies the stage of organization or social efficiency, and it is this stage which Germany has reached to-day.

The Emperor Wilhelm II says: —

The great ideals have become for us Germans a permanent possession, while other nations have more or less lost them. The German nation is now the only people left which is called upon in the first place to protect and cultivate and promote these great ideals. . . .

In the same spirit the Kaiser said in an address at Bremen: —

God has called us to civilize the world: we are the missionaries of human progress.

Shortly afterwards, again: —

The German people will be the block of granite on which our Lord will be able to elevate and achieve the civilization of the world. . . .

Von der Goltz said: —

We must understand, and make the youth of our generation understand, that the time for repose has not yet come, that the prediction of a final struggle to assure the existence and the grandeur of Germany is not a mere fancy born in the minds of ambitious fools, but that it will come one day inevitably, violent and serious, as is every decisive struggle between peoples each of whom the one desire is to have its superiority over the others definitely recognized.

Herr Loeber says: —

All that is good and noble, all that is healthy and healing, in German fashion will after the war prove a blessing to other nations as well: German loyalty, German honesty, German conscientiousness, German sense of duty, German truthfulness, German earnestness, German cordiality, German industry, German perseverance. The world is completely diseased. It may be that the Lord God will be pleased to use the German nation as physician to the suffering world.

Dr. Lasson, Privy Councillor and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Berlin, in the early part of the war, wrote as follows: —

We are morally and intellectually superior, beyond all comparison, as are our organizations and our institutions. Our army is the epitome of German intelligence and moral excellence; its perfect discipline is well known.

We do good deeds to all people. Louvain was not destroyed; only the houses of the murderers. We Germans give our judgment only after an inquiry has taken place. The Cathedral of Rheims is not destroyed — the French

caused the damage. Germany has taught the world how to carry on war and politics in a conscientious and proper manner. England will come to nought. The real enemy is England. Woe unto thee, England! God is with us and the just cause.

Because we are efficient and morally superior, all those who cannot attain our moral strength are afraid of us, and think us dangerous. We are the freest people of the earth, for we obey, and our law is Reason. Our successes in war and peace are deserved, the price of infinite striving. Our Kaiser, our Chancellor, our leading men have nowhere their equals, like our people. Humaneness, gentleness, conscientiousness, Christianity, are our distinguishing marks. "In a world of wickedness we represent the Love which is of Heaven, and God is with us."

The German God according to war sermons

A great many volumes of sermons have been published by distinguished preachers breathing the same spirit. I quote briefly.

Dr. John Rump, of Berlin, in the course of a sermon said:—

It is our duty to labor on in the German mission, which consists in revealing God more completely to men. We shall succeed in this, even were the world still fuller of the demon than it is. . . . By our domination over the world, which, as we hope, will be the exterior result of this war, God will establish his sovereignty among the other nations. By each victory which He sends us, He prepares for us the material means of accomplishing our mission to humanity.

Walter Lehmann, pastor at Hamberge, in Holstein, in his collection of sermons published, with the Iron Cross, under the title of "The German God, 1915," says:—

The German soul is the soul of God; she should rule over humanity, and she shall so rule.

God, who is nothing else than the deepest, the most absolute, the most intimate principle of our soul, the purity and verity of our sentiments, the justice and the loyalty of our acts, the moral necessity of our struggle, this God which we only, the Germans, can have in this war, this German God is our best and deepest succor.

The German God has come to life!

III. The Inferiority of Other Nations

With this sense of superiority in most fields of human endeavor, there grew a certain contempt for other peoples, and a sense of exasperation that inferior peoples should exclude Germany from her share of the earth's surface.

From the extracts made from the introduction to the dispatches from the Belgian Ministers, one can get an exact idea of the views of the German Government as to England, for that introduction was issued by the German Foreign Office.

The general belief in Germany and Austria-Hungary is that England is in the last analysis guilty of this war. In a statement made to the Associated Press correspondent near Verdun, January 22, 1916, the German Crown Prince said: "We are convinced that the day will come when the people of Russia and France will find out that they are only doing the dirty work for England."

The general feeling against England is expressed by Professor Meyer in these words: —

Worst of all the things, however, which the war has brought to light, is the ruthlessness shown by England and the appalling decadence of English character. The world knew long ago how many lies and empty phrases were hidden behind the English cloak of hypocrisy, how little the

Englishman cares about "fair play" when his own advantage is concerned; but no one had imagined the depths of immorality which the war has revealed. We have found that the English gentleman shrinks from no crime, not even murder, so long as he can preserve outward appearances.

Professor Rohrbach, speaking of the Zeppelin raids, says: —

If we can cover with fire a large enough territory in England so that the conflagration will strangle the breath of that nation and force it to stretch out its hands toward peace, we have a right to make use of that means. Mercy toward such an enemy is cruelty toward our own compatriots. *It may be that after the war we will recall with a shudder the severe steps they have forced us* to take; our reply will be: "It is not we who wanted this, but you yourselves!"

Among the most influential of German publicists is Friedrich Naumann, author of "Central Europe." At the conclusion of a lecture that he recently delivered in Vienna, he sketched the relations of England to Austria-Hungary, "which have been marked by the same selfish seeking after her own profit." "They talk of themselves as the Elect; they are not the Elect of God, but of the Devil." Addressing working men in his audience, he described England as the country where capitalism had celebrated its worst orgies. "The English national character is of no value to humanity, and is responsible for all the evil on earth."

IV. Germany's Policies for Expansion and Methods to be employed

Influenced by the situation of their country, combined with the feeling of absolute superiority over all other peoples, leaders of German thought produced a mass of literature setting forth what Ger-

many must have, and indicating the methods of achieving her aims. These ideas reacted on minds already persuaded of the great cultural mission of Germany to advance civilization. This was to be done in accordance with Germany's ideas and by a forceful method.

I quote from the earlier writers who greatly influenced German opinion and German policy: —

We must create a Central Europe which will guarantee the peace of the entire continent from the moment when it shall have driven the Russians from the Black Sea and the Slavs from the South, and shall have conquered large tracts to the east of our frontiers for German colonization. We cannot let loose *ex abrupto* the war which will create this Central Europe. All we can do is to accustom our people to the thought that this war must come.[1]

Let us bravely organize great forced migrations of the inferior peoples. Posterity will be grateful to us. Coercion will be necessary. Such tasks are also war-tasks. Superiority of creative power is but a means. . . . Those adversaries who succumb, as they try to bar our passage, must be driven into "reserves" where we shall keep them segregated that we may obtain the space necessary for our expansion.[2]

If we *take*, we must also *keep*. A foreign territory is not incorporated until the day when the rights of Germans are rooted in its soil. With all necessary prudence, but also with inflexible determination, a process of expropriation should be inaugurated, by which the Poles and the Alsatians and Lorrainers would be gradually transported to the interior of the Empire, while Germans would replace them on the frontiers.[3]

In 1911, Tannenberg — in "Gross Deutschland" — worked out the theories and plans for expansion in Europe. Dealing with Holland he says: —

[1] Paul de Lagarde, *Deutsche Schriften* (4th ed., 1903), p. 83.
[2] Klaus Wagner, *Krieg* (1906).
[3] F. Lange, *Reines Deutschtum*.

Germany in 1870 had many reasons to act against Holland, since her King, if only through his intention of having Luxemburg obtained for Napoleon III, had been the immediate occasion for the war. The Francophile tendencies of King William III of Holland were at that time well known to all the powers; unfortunately the Minister Thorbeke succeeded in hindering the King of Holland from openly taking the part of France, retarding thus the annexation of the Netherlands to Germany and preserving for a while longer their independence. It is a great pity that that opportunity should have been lost. If the inevitable had been realized at that time, the hardships inseparable from any transformation would have been forgotten to-day, as it has happened in the case of Hanover.

Holland with her royal family, her European dominion and her colonies in South America, the Isles of the Sonde, and of Australasia, must come into the German Empire as a State of the "Bund." The same is true for Belgium. The Congo State must become a German colony. By the entry of Belgium into the German Empire the ancient German frontier near Lescaut, of the time of Charles V, would be reëstablished. It would be the beginning of the reconstitution of our ancient western frontier. We finished this matter with the French Republic and the Napoleons in 1871; with the kings of France, and in particular, with Louis XIV, we have not yet settled our accounts. The Continental tariff frontier of Germany in the West, next to the Netherlands, will thus be suppressed, and the ports on the Meuse and the Rhine will recover their former hinterland and will know a new prosperity. Luxemburg and Switzerland will enter likewise into the new Empire, while preserving their actual constitution. But they will be obliged to furnish their contingent to the defense of the Empire which has already for a long time protected them, conformably to the necessities of Greater Germany.

Frymann, in his book, "Wenn ich der Kaiser wär!" says: —

We shall, therefore, as soon as our antagonism with Eng-

land and with France — or with a single one of these nations — shall give rise to an armed conflict, be obliged to put Holland and Belgium into the position of choosing between our adversaries and us. If, listening to the voice of reason, these two States decide in our favor, we will assure them their independence under the same title as that of the other confederate States of the German Empire; if they go over to the enemy, we shall purely and simply annex them, all in anticipation of the victory of the German armies.

In the case of annexation, there would be incorporation with Prussia, in such a way that the two new provinces would know that we have not forgotten the lessons taught us by the resistance of the Danes, the Poles, and of the people of Alsace-Lorraine. Their colonies would be submitted to the administration of the Empire, which, on the other hand, would support the expenses pertaining thereto. In this manner, the Belgian and Dutch colonies, which are much too large for small States, could be developed according to their value. If things should come to this pass, the mistakes of the Hapsburgs and of the Congress of Vienna at length would be retrieved, and the German people would have finally reconquered their ancient possessions on the shores of the North Sea.

Tannenberg, writing in 1911, in anticipation of a war with France in the near future, defines the treaty of peace in these terms: —

1. France cedes to Germany the departments of the Vosges with Epinal, Meurthe et Moselle with Nancy and Lunéville, the eastern half of the Meuse with Verdun, and the Ardennes with Sedan; altogether about 17,114 kilometres. This country is at the present time sparsely populated, 69 inhabitants to the kilometre. This is hardly half the density of population in Germany. This country of the high basins of the Meuse and the Moselle to be ceded to Germany counts only 1,192,453 inhabitants.

2. France takes the inhabitants of these territories and installs them elsewhere. This migration shall be carried out

in the space of one year dating from the signature of the treaty of peace. The country will be divided into rural domains of forty to sixty arpents, according to its quality, and will be divided as a reward among German soldiers who shall have distinguished themselves during the war. The immovable properties of the cities shall be likewise distributed in lots of approximately the same value. Soldiers who fought in the War of 1870–71 will also be admitted to this distribution.

3. Holland with her royal house enters into the German Empire under the title of a confederate State in full exercise. Holland enters into a German tariff union (*Zollverein*) without paying indemnity, or engaging herself to special obligations, which constitutes a favor of special weight in all the affairs of this country especially in gardening and agriculture, which at the mouths of the Rhine profit by such happy climatological conditions. Java is reserved to Holland as a private colony. The other colonies of Insulinde, Surinam, and Oceanica, become the common property of the German Empire. We do not ask from Belgium any special advantage from the colonial point of view: on the contrary, we consider that a possession like the Congo State, much too large for that small country, must in its entirety pass under the power and the protection of the great German people and of the German Empire.

4. France takes the Walloons inhabiting Belgium to colonize her territories, which are empty of inhabitants. The migration must be accomplished in three years. The property of the Walloons and of the inhabitants of the districts of the upper Moselle and of the upper Meuse, merged in the new province of Western Franconia, both in houses and in lands, will be estimated by experts and paid for to those having rightful tenure by the Republic, out of the indemnity of war to be paid by France to Germany. The frontier regions thus emptied along the middle course of the Meuse will receive an immigration of German soldiers who shall have distinguished themselves during the war, in such a manner that this frontier province will have within a few years a purely German population. The abnormal tariff

frontier between the German Empire and its ports from the Meuse and on the Rhine will thus be suppressed.

5. France cedes to Germany the ownership of the billions which she has lent to Russia.

6. France pays to Greater Germany thirty-five billions of marks in cash. (This is half the liquid funds which France boasts of possessing. This loss will strike France in the spot where she is both most sensitive and most able to respond. Money has been since the end of the First Empire, the idol of the French and their overthrow. If France had not had more liquid money than any other people on earth, she would never have become the benevolent banker who imposes his loans upon our enemies. Let us take from France this accursed money and at last we shall have peace; we shall pursue our pacific development and be able to take very good care of ourselves without system-of-six-children.)

7. France declares her acceptance of the incorporation of Luxemburg and of Switzerland in the German Empire.

9. France renounces her fleet, which passes into the possession of the German Empire.

10. France renounces her colonies, except Algeria, to the profit of Greater Germany.

12. France signs the new treaty of commerce with Germany, which is adapted to the conditions created by the transfer of powers from one to the other.

Such are the articles of the Peace of Brussels between Germany and France. They set the definitive seal of superiority upon the German people, rich in children, over France, poor in children. The course of armaments since the Treaty of Frankfort is concluded.[1]

Now, a short time later, Frymann, reviewing the recent book of Tannenberg, considered it as indeed "a little extravagant," but recognized that the more important German reviews here and there expressed analogous ideas. So that it must be frankly admitted that they were in the air. And he adds: —

[1] *Gross Deutschland*, pp. 237–39.

Since we have touched, in passing, upon the "question of evacuations," let us say here that it is not perhaps so much out of place to speak openly on this point, in order that our adversaries may know clearly that such desperate measures already find defenders in Germany; they will understand then, that a certain prudence is absolutely imposed upon them, for it will not answer to excite too much the *furor Teutonicus*.

To the man formed on traditional ideas, his hair will stand on end, at the demand that a country inhabited by Europeans should be *evacuated*, which signifies the violent interruption of a development many centuries old; furthermore, this thought wounds the sentiments of the cultivated man, and it is in opposition to the modern theory of the rights of man which protect in their possessions the private citizens of belligerent nations. But if we look deeply into the particular situation of the German people, which is completely encircled in Europe, and which, if it continues its vigorous growth, would run the risk of stifling unless it could give itself air, it must be clearly recognized that the case may present itself in which Germany shall have to require from her vanquished adversaries depopulated regions, either on the west or on the east, — unless, indeed, we have beyond the sea colonies to populate, or shall make up our minds to tolerate anew an emigration of Germans into foreign countries.

We must not think of an offensive war, for the purpose of the occupation of foreign territory, with their evacuation as our object; but we must, on the other hand, accustom ourselves to holding such measures admissible, as response to an enemy attack; while a war of brigandage (*Raubkrieg*) is repugnant to our conceptions, a punishment for a criminal aggression appears to us justified, even if it takes this severest form, for "necessity knows no law." We may, moreover, in this sense, consider as equivalent to a defensive war any war which should be conducted offensively from the German side, but which we should have been obliged to undertake to anticipate our enemies.[1]

[1] *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär!* pp. 140–41.

The treatment of conquered people is thus described by K. F. Wolff, a distinguished ethnographer: —

Conquerors are acting according to the laws of biology and logic when they endeavor to do away with foreign language and to annihilate foreign nationality. Hence there must be no compromise, but merely insistence upon the right of sovereignty, the widest possible extension of power and the sternest refusal of political rights.

The constitution is made for the conqueror, never for the conquered. Let the conquered enjoy the rights of man, but under no pretext the rights of sovereignty. We are born men, we win the position of lords and masters on the field of battle.

Referring to France he says: —

The conquering nation must be rich in men, so that it may be able to flood the conquered country with its own people. Hence only nations with large populations have a moral right to conquest; for it is unjust that such a nation should be overcrowded within its frontiers, while a neighboring people with fewer citizens should live luxuriously on richer territory. It is still more unjust, it is really criminal, that a nation with a decreasing birth-rate should take possession of foreign countries with the sole and unworthy object of recruiting soldiers whom it needs for the realization of its selfish schemes.[1]

He deals with the ethics of conquest in these words: —

The conqueror must have an absolute will to dominate, and must strive for the political and ethnical annihilation of the vanquished. He must entirely ignore the fallacy that

[1] From the *Kölnische Zeitung*: "For the last hundred years there has been no progress in any branch of French industry."

From Paul Rohrbach (*Der deutsche Gedanke in der Welt*): "As for France: 'Her destiny, for reasons which, in spite of all proffered explanations, remain among the enigmas presiding over the birth and death of peoples, seems to be that she must disappear from the list of great nations.'"

the vanquished have the right to maintain their language and nationality. A victorious people, invading a country, must insist upon its privileges in the most ruthless manner; it will commit no injustice in doing so, it will merely derive the natural consequences of its position.

Such men as this can conquer, they are allowed to conquer, it is their duty to conquer. They must be suzerain, both for their own advantage and that of others. For invasion by a noble, high-minded race does not mean annihilation but amelioration, it is in the service of the Lord of armies, and his work is a work of deliverance!

Dealing with these small nations, Herr Rohrbach writes: —

In comparison with former days the realm of science is now so stupendous that only a great nation is capable of coping with it. German students outside our frontiers, the Dutch, and our more distant kinsmen, the Scandinavians, are all obliged to form a kind of fraternity with German science, both in order to rear scholars and to facilitate their researches; they are too few in number to be able to produce first-rate scientific work or institutions in all branches. . . . This also applies to other spheres. Just in the same way that small States cannot build a fleet of modern Dreadnoughts, because they would be ruined by the cost of one, so they are incapable of producing a complete civilization from base to apex because it requires too broad a foundation.

Tannenberg elaborates the policy of the new and greater German Empire: —

We wish in a new Empire to begin a new life whose supreme law is the welfare of the Germans, and to execute this law shall be the principal task of Greater Germany. All special laws are only corollaries to this fundamental law.

The Reichstag of Greater Germany is elected by universal suffrage. The rights of the electors may be acquired by every married man of thirty. The right to vote is conferred upon all those who are admitted to the rights of full citizen-

ship. Only those can become full citizens whose mother-tongue is German, whose culture is the object of the common school, whose blood is purely German, and who take the civil oath. The rights of full citizenship may be withdrawn by the court for transactions, words, or acts contrary to the interests of Germanism.

Books, newspapers, periodicals, and circulars can appear only in German. Books coming from outside can be imported only with the authority of the State and for a revenue stamp of one hundred per cent *ad valorem*. Foreign newspapers must obtain the same authorization, pay the same tax, and bear the same stamp. The State has the right to requisition gratuitously from each newspaper the first page of the chief edition to expose to the people the views of the Government without party interpretation. . . .

In greater Germany no foreigner can acquire houses or estates, etc.[1]

We can note the partial working-out of these ideas in the deportations from Belgium and Lille and other parts of occupied France, and also in the spoliation of Poland.

V. The Belgian Deportations

Great distress to her inhabitants was the natural result of the stripping of Belgium, so well described by Dr. Rathenau and Dr. Ganghofer. Just as in Poland, everything was done to increase the wealth of Germany and to compel the Belgian workmen to emigrate to Germany. But the Belgians proved stubborn. They refused to assist Germany to win the war against their own brothers, and there was no voluntary emigration on their part.

The "Kölnische Zeitung" makes the following admission: —

[1] *Gross Deutschland*, pp. 82–83.

The spirit of the Belgian people is invincible; the meager results we have obtained by violence in Alsace in forty-five years will not be won in Belgium in less than a hundred.

And that in spite of terrible suffering and misery, while they saw their food being used to support their enemies. Professor Ballod states that Belgium and northern France fed three million German soldiers the first year.

Although the Hague Conventions agreed to by Germany stipulate that "the maintenance of the civil population of an occupied territory must be exactly what its own Government would have done, and that mainly out of the natural resources of the territory itself," and further, that "requisitions can only be demanded, and services imposed on the communes and their inhabitants generally for the needs of the occupying army," in January, 1915, it was decided that "the resources of the subjected country should be devoted to the use of the German Army, and also of the industries assigned to its service." Dr. Ganghofer, an intimate friend of the Kaiser's, studied the Belgian situation in February, 1915, and his report concludes that "all the financial resources of the territories we have conquered have been swallowed up, and secured for our benefit."

On May 2, 1916, the German authorities assumed the exclusive right to provide work for the unemployed. Any person who gave work to an unemployed man, without the sanction of the German authorities, would be punished with a fine of five thousand dollars and three years imprisonment. All appeal to the courts was denied. On May 13, 1916, this order was issued: —

Authorized governors, military commandants, and chiefs of districts to order the unemployed to be removed by force to the places where they are to work.

In the "Contemporary Review" for January, 1917, Demetrius C. Boulger states: —

Since that appeal the deportations of the able-bodied male population have been carried out on a wholesale scale. It is computed that at the moment of writing they reach a total of 350,000 persons, but it seems probable that before they cease this total will be doubled. Already a further number of 50,000 from Brussels alone have been deported. In some places, notably in Limburg, all the males from fifteen to fifty-five have been removed, and in the Hasselt district, for some obscure reason, girls possessing sewing-machines have also been carried off with them. Soon, very soon, there will not be left in Belgium any but women, children, and old men. It would have been a mercy, it would have revealed some slight trace of human compassion, to have deported them to the same place as their husbands and sons. But that is not the German way.

There is one voice from Belgium that has reached all hearts not blinded by ignorance, and that is the voice of Cardinal Mercier. Among the heroes of this war he holds an honorable place. This is his appeal to the neutral world: —

Cardinal Mercier's protest against the deportation of Belgians

The military authorities are daily deporting thousands of inoffensive citizens in order to set them to forced labor.

As early as October 19, we sent a protest to the Governor-General, a copy of which was also sent to the representatives in Brussels of the Holy See, Spain, the United States, and the Netherlands. The Governor-General, in reply, refused to take any steps.

At that time the ordinances threatened only unemployed

men. To-day all able-bodied men are carried off pell-mell, penned up in trucks, and deported to unknown destinations, like slave gangs.

The enemy proceeds by regions. Vague reports have reached us that arrests have been made successively at Tournai, Ghent, and Alost, but we are unaware of the circumstances.

Between October 24 and the beginning of November the enemy operated in the regions of Mons, Quievrain, St. Ghislain, and Jemappes, from 800 to 1200 men being rounded up daily. To-morrow and the following days he intends to fall on the Nivelles Arrondissement.

A poster orders all males to present themselves at Nivelles on November 8, provided with identification and registration cards. They are permitted to bring only a small handbag. Clergymen, doctors, barristers, and schoolmasters are exempt. Burgomasters are held responsible for the execution of the order. There is an interval of twenty-four hours between the posting of the order and deportation.

Under the pretext of the necessity to carry out public works on Belgian soil, the occupying power had tried to obtain from the communes lists of unemployed workmen, which the majority of the communes proudly refused to give.

Three decrees of the Governor-General paved the way for the blow which was struck us to-day. The first, issued August 15, 1915, ordered forced labor for the unemployed under pain of imprisonment and a fine, but stated that it was only a question of work in Belgium. The second, issued May 2, gives the German authorities the right to provide work for the unemployed, any unauthorized person giving work being liable to three years' imprisonment and a fine of twenty thousand marks. The third decree, issued May 13, authorized the governors and military commanders to issue orders for the unemployed to be forcibly taken to places for work.

It was already a matter of forced labor for Belgium. To-day it is no longer a question of forced labor in Belgium, but in Germany for the Germans' benefit.

The whole truth is that each deported workman means another soldier for the German Army. He will take the place of a German workman, who will be made a soldier.

The situation which we denounce to the civilized world may be summed up as follows: Four hundred thousand workmen are reduced to unemployment through no fault of their own, and largely inconvenience the German occupation. Sons, husbands, fathers, respectful of public order, bow to their unhappy lot. With their most pressing needs provided for, they await with dignity the end of their period of trial.

Now, suddenly, parties of soldiers begin to enter by force these peaceful homes, tearing youth from parent, husband from wife, father from children. They bar with the bayonet the door through which wives and mothers wish to pass to say farewell to those departing. They herd their captives in groups of tens and twenties and push them into cars. As soon as the train is filled the officer in charge brusquely waves the signal for departure. Thus thousands of Belgians are being reduced to slavery.

The Germans are not only enrolling the unemployed, but they are also recruiting a great number of men who have never been out of work.

A special appeal to the most powerful neutral country comes from the Holland section of the League of Neutral Nations.

To America from Holland:—

To us this cruelty is more vivid every day. Every day numbers of fugitives, in spite of the deadly electric wire which the Germans have erected along the frontier, succeed in escaping to the Netherlands. From them we learn the painful details of the unutterable despair of the women and children who are left behind and of the agonizing scenes which take place when husbands, brothers, and sons, dragged from their homes and women-folk, are packed into cattle and freight cars and thus transported to an unknown destination and to an unknown fate.

Mr. Alfred Noyes makes an eloquent and moving appeal in the "Outlook" for January 24, 1917. His material is at first hand, and I make from it some extracts: —

In the slave trains they are treated worse than cattle. Sixty men are crammed into a wagon for forty. The wagons are open to wind and rain, and no food, or very little, is provided. Yet as these trains of slaves (who can never be slaves while life remains to them) roll into the stranger's land, the silent crowds who watch them hear the thunder of their national songs; hear a nobler music than all the art of Germany could ever produce; hear these prisoners, that are kings, chanting the "Brabaçonne" and "The Lion of Flanders."

"We used to think that music crude," said a Belgian to me recently, "but we cannot hear it now without tears."

Après des siècles d'esclavage,
Le Belge sortant du tombeau
A reconquis par son courage
Son nom, ses droits, et son drapeau;
Et ta main, souveraine et fière,
Peuple, désormais indompté,
Grava sur ta vieille bannière
Le Roi, la Loi, la Liberté.

And what a symphony is there, transcending anything that the imagination of Beethoven conceived! There, over the sobs and cries of the women and children, with the mutter of the redeeming guns already upon the horizon, rises that mighty chorus, as the trains move out with their triumphing loads of white slaves; and circumstances have added a little to that song: —

They never shall tame him to slavery,
The proud Lion of Flanders,
Their fetters may menace his freedom,
Yet shall his freedom endure.
They never shall tame him to slavery,
The proud Lion of Flanders,
So long as the claws of the Lion
Can strike, and one Fleming draws breath.

Time makes a havoc of cities.
  Thrones may perish like snow.
Armies are hurled to destruction.
  The people, the people shall live.
Our enemies come in their harness.
  With the shadow of death they surround us.
We laugh, we laugh at their fury.
  The Lion of Flanders is here.

Woe to the foe in his folly
  Who comes with his heart full of treason,
Feigns to caress the old Lion,
  And then lifts his hand up to strike.
Ay, when they think he is dying,
  And spurn him, and mock at his weakness,
The Lion of Flanders arises
  And lifts the slow wrath of his name.

They never shall tame him to slavery,
  The proud Lion of Flanders . . .

The New York "Evening Post" for February 3, 1917, publishes a letter from its Paris correspondent, giving some first-hand knowledge of the deportations from Belgium and France. The writer, Mr. Stoddard Dewey, is one of the most careful and trustworthy correspondents in Europe. I have known him for many years. He writes: —

Cardinal Mercier's latest words tell us what is happening in Belgium and Northern France. Cardinal Mercier says: —

> I have seen hundreds of my flock in danger and tears. For three days, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, November 20, 21, and 22, morning and evening, I went through the regions where the first workmen and artisans of my diocese were taken away by force into exile. At Wavre, Court St. Etienne, Nivelles, Tubize, Braine-l'Alleud, I entered more than a hundred homes half empty. The husband was away, the children were orphaned, the sisters were seated with dull eyes and lifeless arms at the sewing-machine — all was in mourn-

ful silence. You would have said there was a corpse in the house. Scarcely did I speak a word of sympathy to the mother than sobs broke forth and lamenting and words of anger, with proud outbursts. The remembrance of these heart-rending scenes never leaves me.

A private letter of Cardinal Mercier, which reached us here in Paris last week, adds: —

> Pray for dear Belgium, suffering as she never suffered before. These hateful deportations, this unpeopling of our homes, the anguish of those spared until now, have brought about a general state of depression which we had not known till now. Souls are inhabited by grief and terror and hatred.
>
> A few, said to have been deported "by mistake," have come back. They say the treatment they have had to undergo is beyond all we can imagine — hunger, cold, exhaustion, so calculated on that the world can be informed only those "voluntarily" out of work have been taken. We are all of us imprisoned here, but if neutrals knew the treatment of us, I believe they would not limit themselves to verbal protests — otherwise we should have to despair of fraternal charity and humanity. . . . We remain steadfast. We wish only a peace signed with honor, lasting and restoring.

Before giving the incidents of the deportations — incidents which have been furnished me at first hand, and, for the most part, officially — I translate literally words from an official letter addressed by Lieutenant-General Hurt, Military Governor of Brussels and Brabant, to the burgomasters of his district. The letter is dated November 12, and was published in the German organ at Brussels, "La Belgique," on the 17th: —

> I insist on this fact that workmen, once they have been transported into Germany, will be able to return to Belgium only in exceptional cases of extreme urgency or justified by reasons beyond dispute.

Such a letter is a necessary comment on nearly all that follows.

The panic-terror into which the Belgian population has been thrown may be imagined from information of the latter half of December concerning the state of things along the Holland frontier. North of Antwerp the Dutch villages have been invaded by hundreds of fugitives who have managed to get out of Belgium. "They sleep in all the barns and on the farm floors. At night there is not one bundle of straw available." (December 17.) A letter received in London says, about the same time, that some of the deported contrived to drop out of the trains while still in Belgium and get to the Dutch frontier. This so exasperated the German authorities that they posted the following notice in the communes of Gemmenich, Monzen, and others: —

> It is forbidden to give shelter to any Belgian civilian who is between fifteen and twenty years of age. It is compulsory to denounce any such civilian to the German police. Those who transgress this order are liable to the penalty of death.

A correspondence from known sources gives these details of the manner in which the deportation is begun: —

> In a little village near Diest an officer and forty soldiers of the Landsturm arrived. Sentinels with loaded guns were posted at each end of the village street. Then the other soldiers searched in all the houses and tore away from their homes all able-bodied men, whether they were out of work or not. In a little while they had gathered one hundred and fifty in the village square. The officer called his men together, and the slaves were led off along the highway to Diest. You can imagine how painful it was. Women and children were in tears, and the men were trying to kiss their dear ones a last time. It was abominable, and the officer was joyful, for one hundred and fifty men as the result of such a raid was remarkable. And this is how Lieutenant von Bissing came back to Diest, swelling and rejoicing.

I have been unable to learn if this warlike lieutenant is anything to Governor-General von Bissing, who, it is just announced, will leave Belgium, his day's work done. Around Brussels, but not yet in the capital, these *razzias* — veritable slave-drives — began in December at Woluwé St. Étienne. At the same time they were carried on around Namur and through the Belgian province of Luxemburg. At Arlon, in the latter province, most of the National Aid and Food Committee, who have had charge of distributing American provisions, have been carried off. The details are edifying.

At two o'clock of Tuesday, November 28, red posters summoned all the men of the town indiscriminately, from seventeen to fifty-five years of age, to come to the building which had been the Jesuits' Novitiate at eight o'clock Thursday morning. Of those who answered the summons four hundred were chosen out, not one of them being without work at home. The excuse for these deportations has been that Belgians were eating their heads off in idleness. More than half of the four hundred were employees, merchants' sons, middle-class people, between eighteen and thirty years of age. The rest were workmen of every kind. Besides these four hundred, a number of railway workers were taken and kept by themselves during five days, and subjected to alternate promises and threats to induce them to work for the German military authorities.

Among the four hundred there were forty-three members of the Food Committee; the director for the whole region, a man of forty; the secretary-general, of about the same age, and nearly all those actively employed, even to the typewriter of nineteen. Those who kept the provision dépôts (American supplies, for the most part) and the managers of the distribution in six neighboring communes, including chauffeurs, carmen, and laborers, were all taken. It is hard to see how this part of Belgium is now to obtain a sufficient distribution of food. Of the foregoing, I have been given the names and employments. As I write, information which I have not yet been able to verify comes to hand that, in one such center, an immense quantity of American provisions

was left without keepers and has been carted off by the German authorities.

At Dour, a little place in Hainaut, one hundred and thirty-seven men were carried off to Germany, of whom one hundred and seventeen were actually taken by force from their work. Of twenty others deported as workmen out of work, not one was yet seventeen years old — and four of them were students at school. In the single locality of Andennes, province of Namur, seven hundred and sixty men of every condition of life were carried off. The women followed the German soldiers, spitting at them in their despair — and the soldiers seemed ashamed of what they were doing "by superior order."

The Belgian Syndicalist Committee, in the name of both Socialists and Independents, declared to Governor-General von Bissing: —

> Citizens of a modern state, without having infringed regulations or decrees, are thus condemned in mass to forced labor.

The Municipal Council of Brussels added: —

> It is certain that the labor which is to be imposed on our countrymen has for its exclusive aim to fortify Germany economically, and even militarily. This circumstance shows still more clearly the character of slavery and servitude with which the measure threatens our citizens.

So far I have spoken only of men. I do not dare to publish details furnished me of the deportation of women — medical examinations, such as soldiers are subjected to, which for the daughters of invaded Belgium and France are but the beginning of unspeakable evil.

The following "appeal of the women of France to the women of all countries" has been issued: —

> Among the solemn protests which the whole world is raising against the deportations, French women wish that their voices should be heard.

How can they help trembling with indignation as they learn that, under the German yoke, there disappears all respect for the family and its ties? They learn that women of France, of Belgium and Servia, and others still have been or are to be torn cruelly from their husbands and children whenever the invader needs them for the service of his officers or mills or trenches.

Among all the enemy's crimes, not one so chokes with anxiety the heart of woman. Is it not round the woman that every civilization has grouped the family? Is it not the long patience of woman that, through the centuries, has defended the intimacy of home, the weakness of childhood, the morality of youth?

This is why we invite women — all women — to join in our protest. All are enlightened, not one can be ignorant of international laws slowly wrought out for the safeguard of non-combatants — and none can be ignorant that, by the very avowal of those who are responsible, such laws have been trampled under foot.

The stirring protests of the highest political, social, and religious authorities have been unable to stop these brutal dispersions. The criminal governments pursue them, counting on the fear or apathy of the peoples.

Are they to have the support of women's silence? Shall women forget that the respect of another's right is the surest guarantee of our own right and that — should history in its returns expose to like dangers other generations and other peoples — they and their daughters could lift up their voices neither to complain nor in malediction?

To whatever country she may belong — ally, neutral, or enemy — each woman must acknowledge her responsibility. To be silent is to absolve the soldiers who violate homes and arrest passers-by to choose their victims — it is to become their accomplice. To be silent is forever to renounce all appeal to right and treaties, all demand that to private or public action there shall be given the authority of a moral foundation.

Who is the woman that will refuse to hear our appeal and judge savagery?

Let all those whose home is respected unite in one movement of justice and compassion. From the height of their anguish and sorrow, our sisters, victims of force, can now hope for help only from the conscience of the world.

(Signed) National Council of French Women (150 societies); French Union for Woman's Suffrage (80 regional groups); Society for the Improvement of Women's Lot; Fraternal Union of Women; Society of Women's Suffrage (representing altogether more than 1,000,000 French women).

I quote here the opinion of ex-Secretary Root, one of the greatest men who ever filled the office of Secretary of State of the United States. Mr. Root said at Carnegie Hall, Friday, December 15, 1916: —

I am glad to join my voice to-night with my fellows in this free land in condemnation and protest upon this new outrage that is visited on the sore and bleeding Belgians.

Poor Belgium — her stern and noble resolve to keep the faith was her only crime, and she has been punished as if her people were the vilest on earth. Her towns have been burned, her noble and stately monuments have been leveled to the earth, her women and children and old men have been murdered, her country has been brought under the sway of a foreign invader, and now she has been bled white by vast exactions of money and of produce. Every effort for her to revive her industries has been denied, and now, because she has suffered thus, her men are to be carried away to forced labor as slaves.

Let me read the effective words of that great-hearted and noble prelate, whose figure, appealing to all that is best in humanity throughout the world, fearless of the mighty power that seeks to constrain him, will make the name of Cardinal Mercier great in history. Let me read from his pathetic appeal: —

We, the shepherds of these sheep who are torn from us by brutal force, full of anguish at the thought of the moral and religious isolation in which they are about to languish, impotent at once of the grief and terror in the numerous homes shattered or threatened, appeal to all souls, believers or unbelievers, in Allied countries, in neutral countries, and even in enemy countries, who have a respect for human dignity. May Divine Providence deign to inspire all who have any authority, all who are masters of speech or pen, to rally round our humble Belgian flag for the abolition of European slavery.

VI. The Spoliation of Poland

The spoliation of Poland followed similar lines to the spoliation of the territory in France occupied by the German armies, and the system of requisitions in Belgium. The coal-mines of Dombrova were shut down, the machines and shafts destroyed, to favor the Silesian coal-fields across the Prussian frontier. Manufacturing towns like Dombrova, Lodz, and Sosnovitse, that competed with German industry, were stripped.

A million people were idle and on the verge of starvation. The Germans harvested the crops, invading Poland with all kinds of German machines, motor-lorries, and machines for digging up potatoes, and they dug and threshed and transported through the autumn of 1914. The foodstuffs around Lodz were mobilized most effectively by this German organization. Only, when they were collected, the Imperial German Government commandeered all. The motor-lorries spirited them away into Germany, while Lodz and Dombrova continued to starve.

A German company was formed and given an absolute monopoly in trading in foodstuffs in Poland

generally. Farm produce was purchased, when not commandeered at a low rate, and sold at a high rate, and the company was able to declare a profit of one hundred and forty per cent. An embargo was put on all stores of grain and potatoes, ordering that after fifty-four pounds had been left to each inhabitant the remainder must be handed over to the German company. So profitable was this food monopoly that other articles were brought under the same régime. A War-Potato Company was formed in Berlin to requisition the potatoes in Poland for the alcohol refineries in Germany. This alcohol was reimported into Poland, while the Polish refineries were kept idle. A coal monopoly was also established, and the price of coal doubled.

Just as in Belgium, all kinds of important machinery were taken, including parts that are very difficult to replace. Then raw materials, oil, leather, sulphur, iron, wool, cotton. These stores were sold to German manufacturers at low prices. If the German authorities were trying to destroy Polish industry, they used the right methods.

Here is a quotation from the "Nowa Reforma" of November 20, 1914, which explains the operations of the Posen "Import Company Ltd." :—

A communication from Lodz, dated November 18, describes the unfathomable distress of the city. Prices are higher than the highest known anywhere else. According to the "Nowy Kuryer Lodzki":—

> At a sitting of the Town Council of Lodz Mr. Winnicki, a town councillor of Polish nationality, raised the question why the German "Import Company," which has been invested by the German Government with the

monopoly of buying grain for Russian Poland, pays seven and a half roubles for one hundred weight of rye, when it buys it in the districts of Russian Poland under German occupation, but charges at Lodz twenty-three roubles for a bag of war-flour which contains hardly forty per cent of the one hundred weight of rye. In answer to Mr. Winnicki's question the senior burgomaster, Herr Schoppen, answered that an injustice is certainly done to the inhabitants of Lodz, but that he could do nothing to lower the prices, since the prices at which the "Import Company Ltd." bought the grain in Russian Poland, as well as the prices it charged for grain at Lodz and elsewhere, had been fixed by Field-Marshal von Hindenburg, supreme commander in the East, and could not, therefore, be modified by the town administration.

The scarcity of fuel in Lodz is equally the fault of the "Import Company Ltd." The town requires about one hundred and fifty railway trucks of coal a day, and has to import it by way of Germany instead of getting it straight from the Polish coal-fields. This city of half a million inhabitants has no stores of fuel, and if the railway communication is interrupted it may be left destitute of fuel altogether, especially as the forests round Lodz have been cut down during the war.

On July 1, 1915, a final order was published "for securing the grain in the districts of Poland situated on the left bank of the Vistula and remaining under German administration, for the needs of the German Army, the German market, and of the population inhabiting the occupied territory."

The "Nowa Reforma" of October 7, 1915, is authority for the statement that the Central Committee of Warsaw was suddenly dissolved; upon this Committee depended all the Citizens' Relief Committees which at that time were achieving notable results: —

It was a center to 220 Provincial Committees. It had under its care 17 hospitals, more than 200 tea-houses, 300 to 400 schools and homes for children, and some 40 or 50 cheap restaurants. It also had at its disposal 17 wholesale stores with a working capital amounting to about £400,000. It took special care of hygiene and poor relief.

Amid the disorganization caused by the war, the Committee at Warsaw was the one institution which successfully organized relief for the population and to a large extent alleviated the condition of the poor. Moreover, the dissolution of the Central Committee at Warsaw involved a simultaneous dissolution of the Provincial Committees, and that in turn caused the suspension of the district committees and of all coöperative institutions which remained under their direction. All relief action came to a stop.

Here is an exact estimate of the havoc wrought by this master-stroke of German organization in Poland (furnished in a statement compiled, in authoritative Polish quarters, during December, 1915): —

> The closing of the Committee resulted in the closing of the following institutions: —
>
> 1. About two hundred Citizens' Committees in the Government of Warsaw.
>
> 2. About two hundred wholesale provision shops of the Committee. The turn-over of the wholesale establishment of the Committee, from December to June, was 1,500,000 roubles.
>
> 3. Three hundred schools for small children.
>
> 4. All public educational institutions (libraries, people's halls, etc.) and the civic guard (special constables). Eleven inspectorates of this guard were dissolved, whereby about 6000 special constables were prevented from doing their duty and the Government of Warsaw left without any police protection.
>
> 5. 100 centers of food-distribution.
>
> 6. A refugee bureau which helped about 8000 people.
>
> 7. The valuation of losses caused by the destruction of estates and villages was also stopped. This step is

favorable to the Russian Government, which, on the basis of the valuations of the Central Citizens' Committee, has already paid 7,000,000 roubles compensation.

8. The sanitary activity was stopped. About 20 hospitals and 30 dispensaries had to close their doors. Vaccination of the inhabitants had to be stopped, also the sanitary inspection of shops and goods, hospital buildings, baths and wells.

9. About 150 tea-houses and places for distributing hot water had to close.

10. All the district councils in the whole Government were closed.

11. The rebuilding of the destroyed villages and towns, on which the Central Citizens' Committee had spent hundreds of thousands of roubles, was stopped.

12. Every district council had a coöperative shop, which had to be closed after the dissolution of these councils.

In consequence of this action of the German Government a total disorganization resulted, and the German authorities were absolutely unable to cope with the situation.

The German authorities [writes a Polish correspondent] are doing everything in their power to induce workmen to leave for Germany. They almost force them to go. The workmen, however, are not willing to leave the country, and the majority of them go to work on the land.

The reasons for this policy of spoliation were first to add to the resources of Germany, and then, as a result of the distress, to induce workmen to go to Germany.

Here is a description of conditions at Lodz, published by the "Journal de Genève" on December 1, 1915: —

According to the special correspondent of the "Journal de Genève," the condition of Lodz goes from bad to worse. The two chief evils, as was to be expected, are lack of em-

ployment and exorbitantly high prices. As for the former, the factories are now working only three days in the week, the raw material having been mostly requisitioned by Germany. At first the invaders did everything they could to persuade the artisans to emigrate to Germany, which is at present short of labor. But, when it was found that only a few thousand yielded to persuasion, the President of Police issued a proclamation (end of September) in which, after announcing that the factories would soon be altogether closed and that no relief would be distributed during the winter from any source, he offered navvy work on the repair of the roads and bridges, work which it was known would employ only a limited number, and that only for a short time, as the sole alternative to emigration. That is the dilemma which the artisans now have to face.

This leads to the question of prices.

The German authorities have commandeered all provisions. Wheat may now be sold only by the Goods Importation Company, which buys it up cheap from the peasants and sells the resultant flour (war-flour) at exorbitant prices to the townspeople, who find their bread "simply uneatable," as well as ten per cent above the price to which they were accustomed. The same company has the monopoly of sugar and alcohol. "Huge quantities" of pulse and oatmeal have been exported to Germany, and their price at Lodz has gone up fourfold. The present scheme for exporting to Germany twelve to fifteen million quintals of potatoes will cause a similar rise in what is now "almost the only resource left to the poor." Almost all the cattle have already been exported, and the price of meat, which for some months has been quite beyond the reach of the artisans, has gone up 400 to 500 per cent. Even the handfuls of bread, meat, and flour, which the artisans who have taken work in the fields bring back with them, are confiscated at the city gates, on the plea of contraband.

The following account gives further information as to the situation in Lodz. The "Lodzianin," the Social-Democratic newspaper in the town, says: —

There are about 60,000 householders in Lodz. Every one of them is entitled to a coal-card, and as only 150 of these are issued a day (which makes 4500 a month), the rest are likely to remain without fuel for the winter. The cold favors the development of tuberculosis. Last year we had forty per cent mortality from tuberculosis, although conditions then were much better than can be hoped for this winter. The manufacturers have been told to give support only to those workmen who have been employed by them for no less than fifteen years; that practically means the old people who are not fit to go to work in Prussia. The German administration is assisted in promoting emigration by the municipal authorities, though it is said that there are Poles, too, on the Town Council. The Town Committee for the poor relief helps only those who bring certificates from the German Labor Exchange to the effect that they are not fit to work in Germany.

We raise a solemn protest, in the name of the Polish laboring classes, to all the more enlightened elements of the German nation, and to German Socialists in particular. The present condition of things is reducing the Polish proletariat to mental and physical exhaustion.

That was the last cry of despair before the winter descended upon Lodz like a shroud.

Here are a few sentences from a statement drawn up, in authoritative Polish quarters, as recently as January, 1916: —

On May 22, 1915, all textile mills in Lodz were shut and all stock of raw materials, as well as part of the machinery, were confiscated. The same thing happened a little later in Warsaw and Sosnovitse. . . .

The working-people are starving. Hundreds of people are dying from a new illness caused by the lack of food. . . . The majority of infants have died, and the death-rate is now much higher than the birth-rate.

That is a bare summary of what has occurred; but the agony of Lodz is revealed in detail in the narrative of a visitor to the city, which was published in the "Nowa Reforma," not long ago: —

Wishing to acquaint myself with the misery in the factory towns and to consider means of relief, I went to Lodz. What I found surpassed my most awful fears. The population is slowly dying, after exhausting its forces in a hopeless struggle.

All the factories at Lodz are closed, but some of the rich manufacturers are nobly supporting their employees. They give them a rouble (2*s.*) a week. The poor creatures, who have been subsisting many months now on that pittance alone, are growing anæmic and consumptive; but they are rich in comparison with the families to which the Town Committee allows 40 kopecks (10*d.*) for each adult and 6*d.* for every child.

We see here the German theories of requisition exemplified as explained by Von Hartmann who says: —

The system of requisitions goes indefinitely beyond the simple right to collect provisions in the country where war is carried on. It implies the full exploitation of that country *in all respects*, and whatever the assistance which one is able to promise one's self from it for the army operating there, whether to facilitate and advance its actions, or whether to promote its endurance and insure its safety.

This implies, be it noted, *that military necessities must not establish any distinction between public and private property* and that the army claims the right to take what it requires everywhere and in such a manner as it can appropriate it.

And to this statement Field Marshal von Hindenburg subscribes in a recent interview: —

The country is suffering. Lodz is stricken with famine. That is deplorable, but it is good. One does not carry on a

war upon sentimental principles. The more pitilessly war is carried on, the more humane it is at bottom; for so much the sooner will it be finished. The methods of war, which bring about peace with the greatest speed, are and remain *the most humane methods.*

From the "Dziennik Poznanski" (a Polish paper published at Posen): —

The petition of the Warsaw industrialists for setting the factories at work again was met by a categorical refusal on the part of Besseler [the German Governor], who declared that anybody could find employment in Germany, whence Polish working-men had already sent to Lodz savings to the amount of 40,000 marks!!!

VII. The Deportations from Lille

I first heard of the deportations from Lille from a gentleman from Luxemburg who came to London to see what could be done in regard to the five daughters, from fourteen to twenty-two years of age, of a professor at Lille. These girls had been taken from home and at the end of a month nothing had been heard from them.

Afterwards the French Government published a report of these events from which I make extracts: —

Note of the Government of the French Republic on the conduct of the German authorities toward the population of the French Departments occupied by the enemy.

On several occasions the Government of the Republic has had occasion to bring to the notice of neutral powers the action of the German military authorites toward the population of the French territory temporarily occupied by them, as being in conflict with treaty rights.

The Government of the Republic finds itself to-day obliged to lay before foreign Governments documents which will

establish that our enemies have put in force measures still more inconsistent with humanity.

By order of General von Graevenitz, and with the support of Infantry Regiment No. 64, detailed for the purpose by the German General Headquarters, about 25,000 French — consisting of girls between sixteen and twenty years of age, young women, and men up to the age of fifty-five, without regard to social position — were torn from their homes at Roubaix, Tourcoing, and Lille, separated ruthlessly from their families, and compelled to do agricultural work in the Departments of the Aisne and the Ardennes.

Proclamation by the German authorities

All the inhabitants of the house, with the exception of children under fourteen and their mothers, and of the aged, must prepare themselves to be transported within an hour and a half.

An officer will decide definitely what persons are to be taken to the concentration camps. For this purpose, all the inhabitants of the house must assemble in front of the house; in case of bad weather they are to remain in the passage. The door of the house must remain open. No protest will be listened to. No inhabitant of the house (even including those who are not to be transported) may leave it before 8 A.M. (German time). Any person endeavoring to avoid transportation will be punished without mercy.

The Commandant.

Protest of the Mayor of Lille

This document, as also the one which follows, has been communicated to the French Government, which is in possession of confirmatory evidence in regard to it from several different sources.

Monsieur le Gouverneur, —

Being still convalescent from illness and confined to the house, I hear, with inexpressible emotion, intelli-

gence which I still wish to be able to discredit. I am informed that the German authority entertains the intention of deporting a considerable portion of our population, and of removing them to other parts of the occupied territory. . . .

To destroy and break up families, to tear peaceable citizens by thousands from their homes, to force them to leave their property without protection, constitutes an act of a nature to arouse general indignation.

Protest of Monseigneur Charost, Bishop of Lille

Monsieur le Général, —

Numerous removals of women and girls, certain transfers of men and youths, and even of children, have been carried out in the districts of Tourcoing and Roubaix without judicial procedure or trial.

The unfortunate people have been sent to unknown places. Measures equally extreme and on a larger scale are contemplated at Lille. . . . That mission lays on me the burden of defending, with respect but with courage, the Law of Nations, which the law of war must never infringe, and that eternal morality, whose rules nothing can suspend. It makes it my duty to protect the feeble and unarmed, who are as my family to me and whose burdens and sorrows are mine.

Thus to dismember the family, by tearing youths and girls from their homes, is not war; it is for us torture and the worst of tortures — unlimited moral torture. . . . Morality is exposed to perils, the mere idea of which revolts every honest man, from the promiscuity which inevitably accompanies removals *en masse*, involving mixture of the sexes, or, at all events, of persons of very unequal moral standing. Young girls of irreproachable life, who have never committed any worse offense than that of trying to pick up some bread or a few potatoes to feed a numerous family, and who have, besides, paid the light penalty for such trespass, have been carried off. . . . Their mothers are now alone. They bring to

me their despair and their anguish. I am speaking of what I have seen and heard. . . . We have suffered much for the last twenty months, but no stroke of fortune could be comparable to this; it would be as undeserved as it is cruel and would produce in all France an indelible impression.

Lille, April 30, 1916.

My dear E——,

What I have to tell you is so sad and so long that I have not the heart to write it twice. Will you read this letter and then pass it on to M——, for her to send round and finally keep in her own hands.

My dear M——,

The last three weeks, and especially the last week, we have spent in the most terrible anguish and moral torture possible for a mother's heart. On the pretext of difficulties caused by England in the matter of provisions and of the refusal of the men out of work to volunteer for work in the fields, the Germans have embarked on a forcible evacuation of the population, with an inconceivable refinement of cruelty. They did not proceed as on the first occasion by whole families; no, community of suffering they thought would be too easy for us, and so they took one, two, three, four, or five members from each family — men, women, youths, children of fifteen, girls, any one — whoever was chosen, quite arbitrarily, by an officer. And to prolong the agony for us all, they operated by districts, without even giving notice in which district they would operate each night; for it was at dawn, at three in the morning, that these heroes, with a band, and machine guns and fixed bayonets, would go and hunt out women and children and take them away. . . .

This is the end of this long and miserable story, but I have not been able to depict the terrible suffering of those whose homes have thus been decimated. Many will die of it. As Monseigneur said, it is the passion of our families added to the passion of Christ. One woman sweated blood on seeing her young son taken; he was brought back to her,

but she did not recognize him. It is terrible and our position seems to be very critical.

Letter from M. X. at Lille, to M. V., at Paris

We have seen our streets invaded in the middle of the night by hordes of soldiers, with fixed bayonets and machine guns (how shameful!), tearing young girls of all ages and lads of fourteen from their mothers' arms, without pity for these mothers, who, on their knees, implored their conquerors for mercy; and all these unfortunate creatures, massed indiscriminately with the dregs of the population, packed into commandeered trams, were sent off like troops of slaves to an unknown destination. What impotent hatred is bred in our hearts for the moment, but later what responsibility must be borne by the higher German authorities, from the private to the general! Tell all this to our son.

Letter from X. at Lille, dated May 7, 1916, and addressed to Madame B—— at Paris

Horrible affair at Lille, tell it everywhere; the deportation of 6000 women and 6000 men; for eight nights, at two in the morning, districts invested by the 64th Regiment (spread it in France that it comes from Verdun), forcibly dragged off girls of eighteen and women up to forty-two; 2000 a night. Herded in a factory; sorted out during the day and carried off in the evening; scattered from Seclin to Sedan in abandoned villages, farms, etc.; to cook and wash for soldiers, replacing orderlies sent to the front; working on the land, especially servants and working-girls, few girls of good family.

Letter to M. Poincaré

These girls and lads were taken in trams to factories, where they were numbered and labeled like cattle and grouped to form convoys. In these factories they remained twelve, twenty-four, or thirty-six hours until a train was ready to remove them. . . .

The families so scattered are in despair and the morale of

the whole population is gravely affected. Boys of fourteen, schoolboys in knickerbockers, young girls of fifteen and sixteen have been carried off, and the despairing protests of their parents failed to touch the hearts of the German officers, or rather, executioners. . . .

Sufferings in Northern France

Mlle. L——, aged twenty-six, brickmaker, deported from S—— (Aisne):—

> About 300 of us were shut up in a school in the town; we were forbidden to leave the building. Reveille was sounded at five A.M., and we worked till seven P.M. The work was done in gangs.
>
> The women who refused to work or who declared they could work only after having enough to eat (the food was very bad and very scanty) were beaten either with great cat-o'-nine-tails or kicked, or a large jug of water was thrown over them and they were beaten afterwards.

VIII. The German State of Mind

Many forces, ideas, and circumstances must be taken into account in order to understand the facts which have just been set forth.

First, there is the feeling of superiority on the part of the Germans; secondly, the belief that Germany has a divine mission to uplift civilization; thirdly, the conviction that the Germans are unfairly shut out from sufficient territory in which to grow and prosper; fourthly, that this war was maliciously plotted by her enemies, of whom England was the chief conspirator and criminal; fifthly, that the more terribly war is waged, the shorter it will be, hence resulting, on the whole, in less loss of life and less suffering.

Further, the German people believe that their

government and army in no way offend against the laws of humanity or international law.

Nevertheless, no single fact connected with this war stands out more clearly than that Germany has many times outraged the public opinion of the world, and has done things which have been not only of almost no value to herself, but have undoubtedly caused her enormous disadvantages.

The introduction of poisonous gases greatly increased the resolution against her of her enemies, especially the Canadians.

Then again, how could any people, long before war, devise apparatus to throw burning liquids on their enemies? When one faces this method of warfare it seems equivalent to inflicting capital punishment by burning the prisoner at the stake rather than by using the electric chair.

Here is a copy of an order concerning the use of flame projectors and burning liquids: —

Headquarters
Saint-Quentin, October 16, 1914.

Second Army, Note 32.

Engineers: — General Notice

Attack on fortified positions.

Means at the disposal of the Engineers for fighting at close quarters.

Flame projectors and burning liquids.

These will be placed at the disposal of the Army Corps according to their requirements by the Commander-in-Chief. The Corps will at the same time receive the skilled operators indispensable for working these engines, who will be reinforced, after giving the necessary instruction, by engineers of the companies chosen for this service.

Flame projectors are to be used by engineers specially trained to handle them; they are objects resembling a portable fire extinguisher and eject a liquid which at once ignites spontaneously. The waves of flame have an effective range of twenty square metres. Their deadly effect is instantaneous, and they throw back the enemy to a considerable distance by means of the great heat they generate. As they burn for a period of from one and a half to two minutes, and may be arrested at will, operators are advised to produce short isolated flames, so that they may be able to attack at several points with a single supply of the liquid. Flame projectors are to be used chiefly in street-fighting, and are to be kept in readiness at the point whence an attack by storming starts.

The use of burning liquids greatly embittered the soldiers of the Allies, and increased their determination to go to ultimate victory.

I always heard the Turkish soldiers well spoken of in England. General Ian Hamilton, the English Commander-in-Chief at Gallipoli, told me that although the Turks had the liquid fire apparatus, they did not use it.

Again, the needless destruction of great works of architecture, — as for example, the Cathedral at Rheims, which had stood, untouched, through all the wars of seven hundred years, — and the destruction of priceless creations of art and architecture in all the occupied territory, have served no helpful purpose for Germany, and have added to the mass of hatred and contempt against her.

Major-General von Disfurth (retired), in an article contributed to the Hamburg "Nachrichten," writes as follows: —

Germany stands the supreme arbiter of her own methods. It is of no consequence whatever if all the monuments ever

created, all the pictures ever painted, all the buildings ever erected by the great architects of the world be destroyed, if by their destruction we promoted Germany's victory. War is war. The ugliest stone placed to mark the burial of a German grenadier is a more glorious monument than all the cathedrals of Europe put together. They call us "barbarians." What of it? We scorn them and their abuse.

For my part, I hope that in this war we have merited the title, "barbarians." Let neutral peoples and our enemies cease their empty chatter, which may well be compared to the twitter of birds. Let them cease to talk of the Cathedral of Rheims, and of all the churches and all the castles in France which have shared its fate. Our troops must achieve victory. What else matters?

The execution of Captain Fryatt is another illustration of the mistaken methods of Germany. The English people are slow. No ordinary world-issues would have so unified the English nation and aroused her working-men to a resolution to fight as did this single act. War to-day can be waged only by a highly organized industrial nation, and with the support of the whole body of workmen in industry. At almost no cost to England, Germany performed the miracle of arousing the English working-men, by such deeds as the bombardment of Scarborough, the Zeppelin raids, the sinking of the Lusitania, the execution of Edith Cavell.

It is doubtful, however, if any of these things so hardened English determination as the execution of Captain Fryatt. I was often told, in Germany, of Captain Fryatt's crime, always with great indignation. The submarine captain who sunk the Lusitania was a hero, Captain Fryatt was a criminal. If Captain Turner of the Lusitania had been able to save his ship

by ramming the submarine, he would have been executed by the Germans if he had afterwards been captured. His execution would have been legal — in accordance with laws made in Germany, but recognized by no other nation.

The deportations of the Belgians, the deportations of the French from Lille and from other places in France, the policy of terrorism and requisition practiced in France, Belgium, and Poland, also the theories and plans of requisition of goods and territory, openly published by influential Germans — all these things have tremendously affected the peoples at war against Germany.

I was in France at the time of the publication of the reports describing the deportations from Lille. France was filled with horror and anguish, and with a determination to go on until the possibility of such things ever happening again would be removed forever. France feels that above all nations she is sacrificing life and estate to save civilization from being devoured by a monster. Germany seems to France to be a Frankenstein, with tremendous strength, utterly unmoral, and at the same time utterly wicked.

The state of mind produced in France and England by such things as are here adduced constitutes one of the great obstacles to peace.

War is the great revealer. It strips men of all unrealities and hypocrisies. We see men naked. We are able to evaluate social, industrial, and educational systems. The methods and practices of Germany in conducting this war must have thrown light on her psychology. What, then, is the dominating note in German thought and action as revealed by the war? Is it not her invar-

iable reliance on force and terrorism to accomplish her aims?

Let us consider for a moment the probable origin of the German idea in regard to the efficacy of force and repressive measures. The bottom fact in the national structure of Germany is military discipline. Now, military discipline is largely discipline from the outside. It is imposed discipline, often imposed by force. This idea of making people efficient by force colors all their theories of industry, social organization, government, war, rule over other peoples, methods of diplomacy with other nations. Even in the social and industrial structure of Germany there is a tremendous tendency toward the infiltration of the military principles of discipline. This tendency is inevitable. Under this system the individual is restrained by external forces.

Real discipline, on the other hand, must come from within. Liberty is the first condition of real discipline —the liberty of the individual up to the limits where his liberty interferes with the liberty of others.

Long before this war Mr. Root said to me once: "The great problem in government is to get efficiency without sacrificing democracy."

When the ordinary restraints of civilization were removed from the military forces of Germany in Belgium, their inner powers of inhibition were too feeble to put a limit to the orders, plans, and policies of the German officials.

The revelations of this war make us question the superiority claimed for the German theories of social, industrial, and military organization.

The democratic movement of the age was hindered

in Prussia by the very critical situation of the nation, surrounded by strong enemies. War, sometimes defensive, sometimes aggressive, was the most important influence in moulding the principles and institutions of the German people. The present forms and principles of organization in Germany are the inevitable products of the conditions under which the German Empire was formed.

This war is to determine whether the principles of individual liberty or mass organization are to dominate the world. It is to determine whether the individual is made for the State, or the State for the individual.

IX. Mass Psychology

The new danger to civilization

We are accustomed to exhibitions of mob psychology in which the acts of a few hundreds or of a few thousands shock the world. But in this war we must take into account the psychology of a mass which contains all the people of a nation, or even of a group of nations.

In the world to-day the number and variety of the ideas and factors in life require a vast amount of coördinated activity and thought. In all countries there are numerous organizations, — governments, armies, navies, schools, trades-unions, farmers' unions, etc. There are also industries that require the coördinated knowledge and activity of many people with varied and various skill. The means of travel and transportation, like railroads; the means for the transmission of intelligence, the telegraph, the telephone, also unify a people. But the principal organ of unification is the

printing-press, with its product of books, pamphlets, periodicals, and newspapers.

With all this machinery of unification, plus universal military training, the leaders of thought and action in Germany have organized and carried on a propaganda for more than a generation. Such men as Treitschke, Rohrbach, Schiemann, Reventlow, Tannenberg, Naumann, and hundreds of others, have preached the doctrine of German superiority, expansion, needs, and rights. I have quoted from such sources. At the same time, the Great General Staff have realized in preparation and in act the ideas that had already become the thought of the entire nation.

The writings of Bernhardi have been belittled in Germany, but one can only say that his ideas have all been realized.

Professor Schiemann speaks with unusual authority, and he says about Bernhardi, in a pamphlet in which he answers "J'Accuse": —

> The brave books of Bernhardi, with a clear prevision of what was in preparation, pointed out the necessity of grasping the sword before the conspiracy which threatened Germany should become active. That was the more his perfect right since the threat of war, particularly on the part of England and Russia, had, as we shall see, for years never let up. His writings — in so far as they were not of a purely military character — were inopportune and unwelcome to the Government, since it foresaw the misuse to which they could be put by the evilly inclined. To-day it is unlikely that any one will deny that Bernhardi saw and judged the situation correctly.

Treitschke was also a true prophet of modern Germany. And to understand the German mind of to-day one must read his books.

The solidarity of German feeling is expressed in the "Hymn of Hate" in these words: —

> You we will hate with a lasting hate.
> We will never forego our hate.
> Hate of seventy millions choking down
> We love as one, we hate as one,
> We have one foe and one alone —
> ENGLAND!

All Germany — all the seventy millions — think as one, hate as one, love as one. The "Hymn of Hate" was part of the General Order issued to his troops on November 11, 1914, by the Bavarian Crown Prince.

Now, let us apply this state of mind, this mass psychology, to a study of the treatment of Belgium. Everything habitually done by the most cruel and insensate mob we find repeated in Belgium, even to burning people alive. In fact, in this war, the mass spirit illustrates itself from the North Sea to Bagdad by the use of fire to destroy life. The liquid-fire apparatus invented by the German military authorities carbonizes its victims in a few minutes. The wholesale and continued cruelties inflicted on the Belgian people can be paralleled only by instances in which mobs have had full sway.

The professors and publicists of Germany thought in abstractions; but the execution of their theories involved men and women and children, homes, farms and food, life and liberty, and the sanctity of the family. The Great General Staff put into concrete form the theories of the professors.

If German inventions could enable her military forces to release a poison gas in such quantities and under such conditions as to destroy all the armies op-

posed to Germany, all German people would approve. If a means were devised by them to destroy by fire all the armies opposed to Germany, all the German people would approve. If Germany's submarines sunk every ship at sea, and drowned every sailor and every passenger, all the German people would approve. Neither the German Government nor the German people have disapproved the sinking of the Lusitania.

When I spoke to my friend, Professor von Schultze-Gävernitz, in Constantinople, about the sufferings of the Armenians, he said, "It is thirteenth-century war." Professor Gävernitz is one of the gentlest and kindest men I ever met, but to him that abstract phrase simply covered the whole Armenian tragedy, and dulled his mind to it. He did not realize that his words meant the destruction of modern civilization. It is thirteenth-century war that is now waged from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. It is thirteenth-century war with twentieth-century inventions, and in a twentieth-century world that has endeavored by laws and agreements to shelter the weak and defenseless from the powerful and cruel.

It was my experience, everywhere in Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey, in meeting all manner of people, in military, political, and social circles, to find them gentle, considerate, and sane, devoted to their families and exhibiting noble sentiments in every relation of life. The German people, however, refuse to see disagreeable things naked. Everything that is printed in Germany is in line with their preconceptions. They have an absolute credulity for all that their authorities tell them, and absolute incredulity for everything said by the other belligerents or by

neutrals. It is this state of mind that is blind to Armenia, that approves of the military acts in Belgium, that is swayed by the military authorities, that is called militarism in England and in France.

The prevalence and validity of ideas of conquest, of spoliation, of deportation will be greatly strengthened if Germany wins the war, or if the war is a stalemate. To England and France this is a war, not only for human freedom, but for the mere right to exist.

The present expression of mass psychology in war brings another and an appalling thought, that the very machinery of modern civilization easily becomes the instrument for bringing about such a condition of suffering and oppression as we now see in Europe. The inventions and discoveries that make modern civilization, render possible the creation of a state of mind that will cause a nation or union of nations to threaten the very basis of human liberty.

When Germany wickedly fell upon Belgium, she, at one blow, wrecked the whole structure of law.

Elihu Root, who spoke with the authority of a great international lawyer, and with the reticence and sense of responsibility of a former Secretary of State, in his address in Carnegie Hall, December, 15, 1916, said: —

> Now, I say this law is our law; it is our protection. The rights of man, peace and humanity, cannot be preserved upon impulse alone. Law governing men in the treatment of the weak and defenseless is necessary; and so for years, for centuries, the nations have been building up a code of law, international law, and that law is the protection — the enforcement of that law, respect for that law, obedience to that law, are the protection of our peaceable people, of all

weak and small nations, of all those that do not wish to be armed to the teeth every moment for their own protection.

That standard is now beaten down, it is destroyed, it is set at naught. And if we remain silent, if the great neutral peoples of the world remain silent, the standard is gone forever.

And, mark this, the new standard, or rather, the return to the old standard, of barbarism will not stop with the poor people of Belgium. It will be here! Not perhaps for you and me, but for our children it will be here.

If the civilized world of the twentieth century is willing to stand silent and see these things done, in cumulative progression, in violation of the laws of humanity and of nations, then the civilization of the twentieth century is worse than the savagery of Roman times.

I could not remain silent. I should not respect myself if I remained silent, and I hope, I trust, I pray, that my country will not remain silent.

Explain it as you may, excuse it as you may, disguise it as you may, the people of Belgium by the tens and hundreds of thousands are being carried away into slavery — a thing that has not been done by any nation that claimed to be civilized in modern history.

Mr. Root does not shirk our responsibility. He says: —

America cannot choose at will. We have made professions, we have assumed an attitude, we have taken upon ourselves responsibility, we have declared ourselves the champions of freedom. Ah! Remember, across the half-century, the words of Lincoln: "Fourscore and seven years ago our Fathers brought forth upon this Continent a new nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

One cannot be an American, with the history of America, without responsibility, and that responsibility confronts the people of our country to-day to protect the spirit of American freedom.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side.
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light." [1]

As I am finishing this chapter there come to hand two illustrations of German psychology that the American people can easily understand.

I refer first to the proposal of the German Government to align Mexico and Japan against the United States. Secondly to the charge of Dr. Zimmermann, Foreign Minister of Germany, that the United States endeavored to form a coalition of American Republics against Germany.

Think of the childish fatuity of the suggestion that Mexico, with German aid, at a time when Germany is absolutely blockaded, should set out to dismember the United States! This brings to mind the French belief that the German mind has a child's outlook on international affairs.

Further, let us consider the state of mind of the German Government to think that a people with the high sense of honor of the Japanese should suddenly treat a solemn pact as a scrap of paper!

But the most illuminating revelation is the charge by Dr. Zimmermann expressed in these words: —

And if we really, as the report alleges, considered the possibility of a hostile act by the United States against us, then we really had reasons to do so.

An Argentine newspaper which printed a story a short time ago really revealed the plot in telling that the United

[1] Lowell, *The Present Crisis.*

States last year suggested to the other American republics common action against Germany and her allies.

This plot was apparently not conditional in the least. The news as published by the newspaper "La Prensa" well agreed with the interpretation given, for instance, by the American newspaper man Edward Price Bell, London correspondent, who said that the United States was only waiting for the proper moment in order to opportunely assist the Entente.

The same American stated that Americans from the beginning of the war really participated in it by putting the immense resources of the United States at the Entente's disposal and that the Americans had not declared war only because they felt sure that assistance by friendly neutrality would be during that time much more efficient for the Entente than direct participation in the war.

Whether this American newspaper man reported the fact exactly we were at a loss to judge in satisfactory fashion, since we were more or less completely cut off from real communication with the United States.

But there were other facts which seemed to confirm this and similar assurances. Everybody knows these facts and I need not repeat them.

Dr. Zimmermann's assertion and the proofs he alleges are of exactly the same character as the German charges and proofs against Belgium, and the claim that England was really guilty of causing this war.

All Germany to-day believes that the United States endeavored to form a warlike coalition against Germany. The revelations that have so startled and shocked the American people throw a clear light on all the controverted questions I discuss in this book.

CHAPTER XVI

ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN FRANCE

The records of the alleged atrocities by German officers and German soldiers in France are more terrible than the similar records of atrocities in Belgium. The material in the hands of the French Government convinces the people absolutely of the truth of the charges. The main body of records was secured from the regions temporarily occupied by the German armies before the battle of the Marne. I quote from the French "Official Report on German Atrocities": —

Having been instructed to investigate atrocities said to have been committed by the Germans in portions of French territory which had been occupied by them, a commission composed of four representatives of the French Government repaired to these districts in order to make a thorough investigation. The commission was composed of M. Georges Payelle, First President of the Cour des Comptes; Armand Mollard, Minister Plenipotentiary; Georges Maringer, Counselor of State; and Edmond Paillot, Counselor of the Cour de Cassation.

They started on their mission late in September last and visited the Departments of Seine-et-Marne, Marne, Meuse, Meurthe-et-Moselle, Oise, and Aisne. According to the report, they made note only of those accusations against the invaders which were backed up by reliable testimony and discarded everything that might have been occasioned by the exigencies of war.

In truth it can be stated that never has a war carried on between civilized nations assumed the savage and ferocious character of the one which at this moment is being

waged on our soil by an implacable adversary. Pillage, rape, arson, and murder are the common practice of our enemies; and the facts which have been revealed to us day by day at once constitute definite crimes against common rights, punished by the codes of every country with the most severe and the most dishonoring penalties, and which prove an astonishing degeneration in German habits of thought since 1870.

Crimes against women and young girls have been of appalling frequency. We have proved a great number of them, but they only represent an infinitesimal proportion of those which we could have taken up. Owing to a sense of decency, which is deserving of every respect, the victims of these hateful acts usually refuse to disclose them. Doubtless fewer would have been committed if the leaders of an army whose discipline is most rigorous had taken any trouble to prevent them; yet, strictly speaking, they can only be considered as the individual and spontaneous acts of uncaged beasts. But with regard to arson, theft, and murder the case is very different; the officers, even those of the highest station, will bear before humanity the overwhelming responsibility for these crimes.

In the greater part of the places where we carried on our inquiry we came to the conclusion that the German Army constantly professes the most complete contempt for human life, that its soldiers, and even its officers, do not hesitate to finish off the wounded, that they kill without pity the inoffensive inhabitants of the territories which they have invaded, and they do not spare in their murderous rage women, old men, or children. The wholesale shootings at Lunéville, Gerbéviller, Nomeny, and Senlis are terrible examples of this; and in the course of this report you will read the story of scenes of carnage in which officers themselves have not been ashamed to take part.

On the 6th of September at Champguyon, Mme. Louvet was present at the martyrdom of her husband. She saw him in the hands of ten or fifteen soldiers, who were beating him to death before his own house, and ran up and kissed him through the bars of the gate. She was brutally pushed

back and fell, while the murderers dragged along the unhappy man covered with blood, begging them to spare his life and protesting that he had done nothing to be treated thus. He was finished off at the end of the village. When his wife found his body it was horribly disfigured. His head was beaten in, one of his eyes hung from the socket, and one of his wrists was broken.

During our stay at Nancy and Lunéville, we had the opportunity of receiving a good deal of evidence with reference to crimes committed by the Germans in districts which were still occupied by their troops, and which the majority of the inhabitants had been forced to evacuate. The most cruel of these acts took place at the village of Emberménil. At the end of October or the beginning of November, an enemy patrol met near this commune a young woman, Mme. Masson, who was obviously pregnant, and questioned her as to whether there were French soldiers at Emberménil. She replied that she did not know, which was true. The Germans then entered the village and were received by our soldiers with rifle fire. On the 5th of November a detachment of the Fourth Bavarian Regiment arrived and collected all the inhabitants in front of the church. An officer then asked which person it was who had betrayed them. Suspecting that he referred to her meeting with the Germans some days before, and realizing the danger that all her fellow citizens ran, Mme. Masson with great courage stepped forward and repeated what she had said, and declared that in saying it she had acted in good faith. She was immediately seized and forced to sit down on a bench beside young Dime, aged twenty-four, who had been taken haphazard as a second victim. The whole population begged for mercy for the unhappy woman, but the Germans were inflexible. "One woman and one man," they said, "must be shot. Those are the colonel's orders. What will you? It is war." Eight soldiers drawn up in two ranks fired three times at the two martyrs in the presence of the whole village. The house of Mme. Masson's father-in-law was then set on fire. That of M. Blanchin had been burned a few moments before.

Treatment of the civil population

I give here a summary made by Professor Morgan from material collected with the most rigorous carefulness: —

As the German troops passed through the communes and towns of the arrondissements of Ypres, Hazebrouck, Bethune, and Lille, they shot indiscriminately at the innocent spectators of their march; the peasant tilling his fields, the refugee tramping the roads, and the workman returning to his home. To be seen was often dangerous, to attempt to escape being seen was invariably fatal. Old men and boys and even women and young girls were shot like rabbits. The slightest failure to comply with the peremptory demands of the invader has been punished with instant death. The curé of Pradelle, having failed to find the key of the church tower, was put against the wall and shot; a shepherd at a lonely farmhouse near Rebais who failed to produce bread for the German troops had his head blown off by a rifle; a baker at Moorslede who attempted to escape was suffocated by German soldiers with his own scarf; a young mother at Bailleul who was unable to produce sufficient coffee to satisfy the demands of twenty-three German soldiers had her baby seized by one of the latter and its head dipped in scalding water; an old man of seventy-seven years of age at La Ferté Gaucher who attempted to protect two women in his house from outrage was killed with a rifle shot.

At Doulieu, which is a small village, eleven civilians were shot; they were strangers to the place, and it was only by subsequent examination of the papers found on their bodies that some of them were identified as inhabitants of neighboring villages. If these men had been guilty of any act of hostility it is not clear why they were not shot at once in their own villages, and inquiries at some of the villages from which they were taken have revealed no knowledge of any act of the kind. It is, however, a common practice for the German troops to seize the male inhabitants (especially those of military age) of the places they occupy

and take them away on their retreat. Twenty-five were so taken from Bailleul and nothing has been heard of them since. There is only too much reason to suppose that the same fate has overtaken them as that which befell the unhappy men executed at Doulieu.

I believe the explanation of these sinister proceedings to be that the men were compelled to dig trenches for the enemy, to give information as to the movement of their own troops, and to act as guides (all clearly practices which are a breach of the laws of war and of the Hague Regulations), and then, their presence being inconvenient and their knowledge of the enemy's positions and movements compromising, they were put to death. This is not a mere surmise. The male inhabitants of Warneton were forced to dig trenches for the enemy, and an inhabitant of Merris was compelled to go with the German troops and act as a guide; it is notorious that the official manual of the German General Staff, "*Kriegsbrauch in Landskriege*," condones, and indeed indoctrinates, such breaches of the laws of war. British soldiers who were taken prisoners by the Germans and subsequently escaped were compelled by their captors to dig trenches, and in a field notebook found on a soldier of the 100th Saxon Body Grenadiers (Twelfth Corps) occurs the following significant passage: —

> My two prisoners worked hard at digging trenches. At midday I got the order to rejoin at village with my prisoners. I was very glad, as I had been ordered to shoot them both as soon as the French attacked. Thank God it was not necessary.

Those who were sent home told of their journey from their homes to the concentration camps in Germany, marches and nights spent in enclosures, in a station, in a church; days without food and crowded into cattle trucks. And then the terrible scene at Lübeck! The men were ordered to get out of the train and were then taken in one direction, while the women were sent in another. Sometimes the separation took place at the outset. "What was particularly revolting," add the commissioners, "was that

the Germany military authority in seizing haphazard the various people who happened to be on the spot, had no compunction in separating the various members of a family. . . . Little children were placed in one convoy and their mothers in another, and some women are still ignorant as to the fate of their husbands."

Like Nomeny, the pretty town of Gerbéviller, on the banks of the Mortagne, fell a victim to the fury of the Germans under terrible circumstances. On the 24th of August the enemy's troops hurled themselves against some sixty *chasseurs-à-pied*, who offered heroic resistance, and who inflicted heavy loss upon them. They took a drastic vengeance upon the civilian population. Indeed, from the moment of their entrance into the town, the Germans gave themselves up to the worst excesses, entering the houses, with savage yells, burning the buildings, killing, arresting the inhabitants, and sparing neither women nor old men. Out of four hundred and seventy-five houses, twenty at most are still habitable. More than one hundred persons have disappeared, fifty at least have been massacred. Some were led into the fields to be shot, others were murdered in their houses or struck down in passing through the streets as they were trying to escape from the conflagration. Up to now thirty-six bodies have been identified. They are those of MM. Barthelemy, Blosse (Senior), Robinet, Chrétien, Rémy, Bourguignon, Perrin, Guillaume, Bernasconi, Gauthier, Menu, Simon, Lingenheld (father and son), Benoit, Calais, Adam, Caille, Lhuillier, Regret, Plaid (aged fourteen), Leroi, Bazzolo, Gentil, Victor Dehan, Charles Dehan, Dehan the Younger, Brennevald, Parisse, Yong, François, Secretary of the Mairie; Mmes. Perrot, Courtois, Gauthier, and Guillaume, and Mlles. Perrin and Miquel.

Fifteen of these poor people were executed at a place called "La Préle." They were buried by their fellow-citizens on September 12 or 15. Almost all had their hands tied behind their backs.

This massacre lasted two days.

The "Nineteenth Century" for September, 1916, publishes the following: —

It is in the neighborhood of Nancy that the most widespread damage has been wrought. The Germans, before they were driven back, swarmed all over the district, and a motor drive demonstrates how much the villages differ in the treatment they received at the hands of the invader. Some escaped lightly, whilst a kilometre or so distant a village has been destroyed, and probably without any valid pretext. Possibly a village that suffered as much as any is Gerbéviller, but it is not unique. German military discipline is too strict for detachments of troops to get out of hand. An orgy such as happened at Gerbéviller could only arise with the connivance of the officer in command.

In one of the houses, which has been recently repaired, Sister Julie, the heroic Sister of Mercy of the Order of St. Charles, is to be found. She is a small woman, wearing the dress of the order, and decorated with the Cross of the Legion of Honor, a distinction conferred on few other women; her face shows keen intelligence, sound common sense, and great courage; a lady who would command respect from all and would prove a judicious friend to those in distress. Her sense of justice would deprive her of all fear, and probably it is to this that she and many others owe their escape. In her small room, recently repaired, and now furnished only with a six-feet square of carpet, four windsor chairs, and a small table with a red cloth, she gave me an account of what had happened and afterwards confirmed in it writing under the seal of the Hospice. From it the following sentences are taken: more might be given: —

> A young woman named Eugénie Perrin resisted the Germans, who, after subjecting her by force to the last outrages, poured petroleum over her and set her on fire. An epileptic, a young man of military age, named Lingenheld, a non-combatant, suffered in the same way in the presence of his mother. A baker was thrown alive into his oven. The mayor's clerk, a man named

François, after having a revolver held in turn to his forehead, temples, and heart, was killed by the officer by a blow on the head. An old man of ninety-nine years named Barthelemy was pinned to the ground by a bayonet through the left eye; whilst other old men were tied together in batches of five and then shot. More than a hundred inhabitants of the village are missing. It cannot be urged as an excuse that the Germans were drunk, and the officer in command could have restrained them if he had so wished; but this unbridled license turned to hatred of their victims as soon as they saw they would have to evacuate the village. Then it was that house after house was systematically set on fire, special appliances having been brought for the purpose. Out of four hundred and seventy-five houses scarcely twenty remain.

After describing an occurrence that I do not care to print, Professor Morgan writes: —

It is almost needless to say that the woman went mad. There is very strong reason to suspect that young girls were carried off to the trenches by licentious German soldiery, and there abused by hordes of savage and licentious men. People in hiding in the cellars of houses have heard the voices of women in the hands of German soldiers crying all night long until death or stupor ended their agonies. One of our officers, a subaltern in the sappers, heard a woman's shrieks in the night coming from behind the German trenches near Richebourg l'Avoué; when we advanced in the morning and drove the Germans out, a girl was found lying naked on the ground "pegged out" in the form of a crucifix. I need not go on with this chapter of horrors. To the end of time it will be remembered, and from one generation to another, in the plains of Flanders, in the valleys of the Vosges, and on the rolling fields of the Marne, the oral tradition of men will perpetuate this story of infamy and wrong.

I publish herewith extracts from an article which

was published on the 18th of October, 1914, in the "Jauersches Tageblatt." Jauer is a town in Silesia, about thirty miles west of Breslau.

The article was written by a non-commissioned officer, named Klempt, 1st Company, Infantry Regiment 54. It is headed: —

A Day of Honor for our Regiment, 24th September, 1914

Klempt tells how on the 24th of September his regiment which had left Hannonville in the morning, supported on the march by Austrian batteries, was suddenly received by a double fire from artillery and infantry. The losses were enormous. And yet the enemy was invisible. At last, however, it was seen that the firing came from above, from trees where French soldiers were posted. From now on I shall no longer summarize, but quote: —

We brought them down like squirrels, and gave them a warm reception, with blows of the butt and the bayonet: they no longer need doctors; we are no longer fighting loyal enemies, but treacherous brigands.

By leaps and bounds we got across the clearing. They were here, there, and everywhere hidden in the thicket. Now it is down with the enemy! And we will give them no quarter. Every one shoots standing; a few, a very few, fire kneeling. No one tries to take shelter. We reach a little depression in the ground: here the "red trousers" dead or wounded lie in a heap around. We knock down or bayonet the wounded, for we know that those scoundrels fire at our backs when we have gone by. There was a Frenchman there stretched out, full length, face down, pretending to be dead. A kick from a strong fusilier soon taught him that we were there. Turning round, he asked for quarter, but we answered, "Is that the way your tools work, you?" — and he was nailed to the ground. Close to

me I heard odd cracking sounds. They were blows from a gun on the bald head of a Frenchman which a private of the 154th was dealing out vigorously; he was wisely using a French gun so as not to break his own. Tender-hearted souls are so kind to the French wounded that they finish them with a bullet, but others give them as many thrusts and blows as they can.

Our adversaries had fought bravely, we had to contend with picked men; they let us get within thirty, even ten metres of them — too near. Sacks and arms thrown away in quantities showed that they had tried to run, but at the sight of the "gray phantoms" fear paralyzed them, and on the narrow path they had to take, German bullets brought them the word of command, *Halt*. At the entry into the screen of branches, there they lay groaning and crying for quarter. But whether wounded slightly or severely, the brave fusiliers spare their country the cost of caring for many enemies.

There has recently been published a book entitled "The Martyrs of Alsace and Lorraine." I quote from a review of the book by M. Stephen Pichon, formerly Foreign Minister of France: —

More than forty-five years have gone by since Alsace and a portion of Lorraine were torn from France. Arbitrary exercise of power, delation, police rule, and terrorism have been the methods of Germanization employed uninterruptedly against the population of the provinces. But what tongue can tell their sufferings since the war began! The treatment that has been inflicted upon them puts them in the rank of the most unfortunate people that history has known. Their martyrdom is equal to that of the Venetians and Lombards, the Poles or the inhabitants of the Two Sicilies. Suspects in Alsace-Lorraine have been dealt with by the Kaiser's agents like the worst malefactors — spies, traitors, or assassins. Long ago the police had drawn up a list of those of them who were to be arrested, imprisoned, deported, condemned, or shot; and even before hostilities

had opened between the two armies the executions had begun. Any one who was regarded as friendly to France was arrested; traders, manufacturers, peasants, landowners, Catholic priests, and Protestant pastors came into the iron grip. The fortresses, and principally that of Ehrenbreitstein, were filled with prisoners.

It hardly needs saying that the women and children have not been spared. Great numbers of these women have been arrested and imprisoned, and even condemned to hard labor! As for the children, they are shot without any form of trial when they are suspected of intelligence or of communication with the French.

Even among the officials and functionaries, nominated and carefully tested as these are by the Prussian authorities, one finds victims of German suspicion. As for the Alsace-Lorraine soldiery who were called to the colors to fight against France, the Germans have rid themselves of difficulties by sending them to the Russian front, by imposing labors upon them above their strength, by torturing them, by bringing about their death by privations and blows.

Another thing that grows is the number of unfortunates whose names are placarded on red posters, and who have been ruthlessly shot, on the pretext of espionage. These placards should be piously preserved and re-read when the time comes. Those whose names are mentioned there will have the right later on to monuments, erected by patriotic piety. So far from the aim that their assassins had in view being achieved, these victims are glorified in the eyes of the population.

It is but a weak and a very incomplete picture that I have given of the sorrows and misery of the French people of Alsace-Lorraine. I ask a place for them in the hearts of our friends.

The two million inhabitants of France in the territory occupied by the German armies are subject to the same régime as are the Belgians, excepting that all the farm produce is taken by Germany. The

French Government buys the food for this imprisoned population, and it is handled and distributed by the American Commission which has charge of the feeding of Belgium.

This is a good place to speak of Mr. H. C. Hoover, the head of the Belgian Commission. Mr. Hoover is responsible for organizing the forces that saved Belgium and the occupied portion of France from starvation.

The feeling in France arising from the absolute conviction of the truth of the records of alleged atrocities is one of the most influential factors in determining France's prosecution of the war to a victorious conclusion.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ALLEGED ATROCITIES BY THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS IN EAST PRUSSIA

Less is known about the invasion of East Prussia by the Russian armies than about any other part of the war area in the countries of Western Europe. Years ago, in traveling through this region, I remarked its appearance of placid prosperity and agricultural wealth. Last February, I saw the terrible destruction in its towns and hamlets. The suffering and deportations of the inhabitants of East Prussia will never be forgotten in Germany.

Judge Nippert, of Cincinnati, brought this message to America from Kaiser Wilhelm II to the President of the United States: —

> It might be well for America to know that of three thousand inhabitants, women, children, and old men, driven by the Cossacks out of one town on the Prussian frontier, across the icy fields and snow-covered steppes into Russia, forty per cent of the children have died and thirty per cent of the women. Ten thousand women and children and old men have been driven into Russia from the Prussian frontier.
>
> It is the fate of these non-belligerents that causes me to express to the President of the United States the wish and hope that America, as the great nation which has done so much for the different war-stricken districts, will not turn a deaf ear to the call of the children and the tears of the mothers who are still surviving Russian captivity to-day.
>
> If America, with her standing among the nations of the world, could exercise her great influence, through her Gov-

ernment and its President, to prevail upon Russia to release the surviving remnant of this vast number of those who have suffered, then America would, indeed, be doing an act of humanity for which my people would be eternally grateful. We ask nothing for our army or for ourselves, but fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, are standing in despair at our frontier looking for the return of those who are near and dear to them, and we are helpless.

A third winter of war in Russia will mean the absolute annihilation of every woman, certainly every child, who is being held captive in the country beyond the Fatherland. Here is an opportunity for America to invoke the spirit of humanity and bring happiness and joy where to-day is only sorrow and distress. . . .

The Emperor, according to Judge Nippert, expressed much surprise that the American people, who had accepted as true all the stories of the destruction of the Rheims Cathedral and the Hôtel de Ville in Louvain by the Germans, should take no interest, seemingly, in the wanton destruction by the Cossacks of churches erected in East Prussia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries by the Knights of the Crusades. Judge Nippert continues:—

While Belgium and Poland had their relief fund, and Northern France its aid, and Servia, Montenegro, Albania, and Macedonia were also under the affluent protectorate of benevolent American millionaires, — even far-off Armenia had her wealthy American benefactors, — poor East Prussia had been left out. The ravages of war have been more violent and more uncompromising there than in any part of the area covered by the armies. And yet, little is known in this country of the extensive material destruction which has been carried on without any military necessity or reason.

The history of sorrow, distress, crime, and devastation, the murder of innocents, the rape of women, torture of

men, destruction of schools and churches, the burning of farms, killing of wonderful Holstein herds — it all goes to make a page in the history of the European war that, as yet, has not been read by the American public. There is no sadder story — none that should appeal more to the sympathetic hearts of a sympathetic nation than this story of Cossack invasion of the beautiful prairies and forests of East Prussia. . . .

The Russians came out of the forest over night like hungry wolves and took possession of the entire country. The bridges to the Fatherland were blown up and the ferries across the Jura were either destroyed or captured by the Russians. Five thousand people were literally marooned. The Germans were unable to drive the Cossacks out of these districts, and up to February 15, 1915, they had undisputed sway and added a bloody page to the history of warfare.

When the Cossacks left, of the five thousand people of the Bearskin district three thousand were carried to the den of the Russian bear. When I say three thousand I do not mean men; I mean women, with all their children. The men were at war, or had been taken prisoners by the Russians early in the game. This fate befell mothers with from two to twelve children, ranging in age from two months to sixteen years. Little girls, little boys — neither sex nor age received mercy at the hands of these Russian brutes.

The Cossacks gathered them like the Texas cowboy would round up his cattle and drove them along the highways into the Russian inferno. Mothers gave birth to children in the forests with the snow for a cradle and a dark Russian pine for a canopy. The children were buried as soon as they were born; a blanket of snow was all that kind Nature contributed to cover the bones of the newborn victims.

Let me tell you that there is in the history of our Western frontier during the bloodiest days of Sioux and Apache warfare nothing that can equal the story of the Bearskin. I have in my possession records of villages, family by family, with the age, and so forth, of the mother and each of the children. And it is shown that of the three thousand who

were carried into Russia forty per cent of the children have died and thirty per cent of the women. The Russian cattle cars and the Russian steppes are no more the respecters of persons, sex, or age than the Cossack, and each has demanded its toll.

From the German official records, I quote extracts:

Atrocities during the first Russian invasion

By U. Brackmann

For other deeds the Russian cannot be excused. When the Russian advance guard, on the 2d and 3d of August, 1914, removed from Eidtkuhnen, not only foodstuffs, but also plundered watchmaking establishments, when they wrested away from those they met their watches and money, then no paragraph in the laws of war can exonerate them. When, on August 3, in Schwiddern, in the district of Johannisburg, whose destructive soldiers without much ado shot at a woman over the crowd when she called to them, "But, men, what are you doing there?" — when they wounded an aged man of eighty years who stood by, and threw him, half dead, into the burning house of his son, those things are, and remain, state of war notwithstanding, nothing more than common murder. From the very first day, the troops conducted themselves, not like members of a regular army, but like true marauders.

The impression made by this absolutely unforeseen and ridiculous behavior of those Russian advance guards is vividly portrayed in the reports made by the border populations. In the district of Johannisburg, for example, several citizens write: —

> During the first days of mobilization, our village, which lies about two kilometres from the border, was overrun, and what is more, it was overrun by Cossacks. They rode in all directions through the village, took twenty-eight horses, pigs, geese, and cows; also money, watches, rings. These they piled on wagons, which

they had stolen from us, and took them over the border. They left us and moved into the neighboring village, where they did the same things over again. To save our lives, we had to flee to the woods, where we secluded ourselves for several nights.

A worse story is told by the owner of a mill in the district of Lyck: —

On August 4, a patrol consisting of twelve Cossacks entered our village, surrounded the homestead of my neighbor, and fired, without any cause, at random at the house. Braving the shots, the son of the house fled over the garden hedge. The Cossacks espied him and called after him to stop. As he did not stand still, they shot him down. I stood about thirty paces away and saw him fall down dead. On the same day, I saw a mason coming on his bicycle from our village. The Cossacks followed him immediately, shot at him, and as he made a halt, seized him, broke his handle-bars, causing the man to cry out miserably. He freed himself, nevertheless, fled into the house, ran up one flight of stairs and flung himself on a bed to hide himself. A Cossack followed on his heels. Then I heard dull shots, and when I ran upstairs with several other men, we found the mason lying in the bed with a deadly wound in the forehead.

Perhaps the best known are the events during these days in Schwiddern, near Bialla, in the district of Johannisburg. To this place, which is very close to the border, the Cossacks came very early and immediately opened a dreadful fire on all the homes and all the inhabitants, without the slightest offense having been committed on their part. As about fifty persons, in sheer perplexity, rushed to hide behind a dense hedge, the Russians dropped fire on the hedge and killed and wounded a line of persons.

All these and many other excesses were committed in the first days after mobilization. When later, the Russian officers excused their atrocities in East Prussia by declaring

that they had been revenged for the crimes committed by our soldiers in Belgium, we knew we were best informed in regard to these perfectly authentic reports, which were nothing more than a palliative that did not tally with the facts. For these misdeeds took place before the entrance of our troops into Belgium, or, at any rate, at a time when the Russians could not yet have obtained any knowledge of the events that took place there. Another reason why their excuse lacks point is because the behavior of the Russians here in East Prussia cannot be compared to the behavior of our troops in Belgium; for until now it has never been proved that the population of our Province ever rose up in arms. Only on one occasion, a few peasants banded together and slew two Cossacks who tried to rape their wives and daughters, and there it was a case of self-defense, which is also permissible in war.

As soon as their hasty retreat made it impossible to transport these people, the troops, with the assent of their officers, hewed down the population without more ado. They did not confine themselves at all to the men, but killed ruthlessly whatever came within the range of their guns and lances. Only in this way can be explained the high figures — 1620 killed and 433 wounded citizens.

It is a usage of war that sharpshooters (*francs-tireurs*) shall be shot and their houses burned down. But how did the Russians do this? On the least suspicion that some one had shot in a village, they killed a great number of persons without the least investigation. Whoever fell into their hands was shot down, bayoneted, or killed with the butt-end of a gun. According to Rittergutsbesitzer Born, these bloody outrages took place in the presence of and with the authority of the higher Russian officers. Without convincing themselves that it was really a question of sharpshooters, they allowed half a hundred persons to be killed.

Harsh war levies and treatment of hostages

When Rössel, a city of about 4400 inhabitants, within one and a half hours was obliged to pay 29,000 marks

($7250), one can see the needless cruelty. Lyck, with 15,000 inhabitants had to pay a contribution of not less than $15,000 as a compensation for Kalisch (25,000 inhabitants), upon which city the German troops had levied a punishment of $2500 because they had been fired upon.

The treatment of our hostages was hard enough. The dragging of the officials of Lyck to Siberia was a bold piece of work. It may be true enough that our regulations provided for the removal of Belgian hostages to Germany, and that they are still being held there to day. But in our case that measure was inevitable owing to the fanatical behavior of the population, who fell to arms like an army of lions; and seriously, hardly even the Russians can deny that there is a huge difference between a German prison in a fortress and the winter quarters in Siberia. But how do these Russian leaders intend to justify the carting-away of thousands of East-Prussian townsmen, and peasants, who, without regard to age and sex, from the infant in arms to the woman ninety years of age, were brought to the interior of Russia? Do by chance small babies fall into the category of "hostages" according to the understanding of the laws of nations?

Summary

The misfortune which the Russian brought upon our Province (East Prussia) is exceptionally great. It is without parallel in history that about 400,000 persons abandoned their homes within twelve hours, that in a few months a total of 870,000 persons were obliged to take flight for a greater or shorter period of time; it is unbelievable that more than 2000 innocent individuals were killed or wounded, 5419 men (mostly the aged), 2587 women and 2719 children, totaling to 10,725 persons in all, were dragged away, and that more than 100,000 lost all their possessions. In such a case, it is our duty to give aid with all our strength and all our means.

CHAPTER XVIII

ALLEGED GERMAN ATROCITIES AGAINST THE RUSSIANS

The allegation of outrages committed by the Germans upon Russians in German territory and in Russia has been drawn up by Colonel Rézanoff, adjunct to the military procurer before the tribunal of the military district of Petrograd, in a book composed of the narratives of eye-witnesses or of the victims themselves, carefully verified by the author, as well as from official documents.

The effect on the Russians of these records of alleged atrocities is the same as the effect of similar records on the French and the English. They have created a state of mind that is hostile to peace without victory.

Colonel Rézanoff commenting on the official documents says: —

Although the exact hour of the departure [from Berlin] of the members of the embassy, which had been fixed by the German Minister for Foreign Affairs, could not have been unknown to the police, this departure took place in the midst of a noisy demonstration hostile to Russia, and the rudest invectives, and was accompanied by deeds of violence. The mobs attacked the carriages as they were leaving the hotel of the embassy, in which were the members of the Imperial Embassy at Berlin and of the various imperial legations to the other German courts. Almost all of these persons received more or less violent blows in the back, on the neck or the shoulders; as, for example, the Minister Plenipotentiary at Carlsruhe, Count Brevern de la Gardie,

and his wife; Mme. Lermontoff, wife of the Minister from Russia to Stuttgart (on whose back an aged gentleman with a white beard and gold-rimmed spectacles broke his umbrella); the Countesses Lutke and Todleben, sisters-in-law of our resident minister at Darmstadt; the Princess Belosselsky-Belosesky, the Secretaries of the Legation Dmitroff and Koutepoff, and many others. Several of these persons as, for example, Mme. Berens, wife of the Naval Attaché, the Secretary of Embassy, Ionoff, and others received light contusions in their faces, from stones thrown by the crowd. The deacon of the Russian church, Lopatka, had his felt hat entirely broken in by a blow from a cane; the hat alone saved him a severe wound. It is only by mere chance that these acts of violence had not more serious effect; the Chamberlain Khrapovitsky, however, former Secretary of the Embassy from Russia to Berlin, received a blow on the head which caused a profuse hemorrhage, required a dressing on the train, and medical care at Copenhagen. The crowds spat full in the faces of most of the ladies, as, for example, the Princess Belosselsky, Mme. Raevsky, the Countesses Todleben, Lutke, and Brevern, etc. The children escaped blows only through the presence of mind of their parents who placed them on the floors of the automobiles.

The German authorities were still less scrupulous in their treatment of the Russian Consular Agents. The Russian Consular Agent at Breslau, Baron Schilling, was arrested in his house on the 2d of August, between five and six o'clock in the afternoon, submitted to a minute search, and imprisonment. In the prison, he underwent a treatment which, in its grossness, differed in no respect from the régime imposed upon the criminals confined in the neighboring cells; moreover, the directors of the prison replied to his most modest requests by refusal, accompanied with insolent taunts. . . . From Königsberg, Baron Schilling and his family, still under the surveillance of a soldier or an officer, were sent to Insterbourg, where they were searched, during which time they were entirely undressed, even the children.

The treatment inflicted by the German authorities on

Senator Bellegarde, the Russian General Commissioner at the International Exhibition of the Press, at Leipsic, Master of the Imperial Court, a man of great distinction and a high Russian dignitary, exceeds in brutality the facts given above. Foreseeing the possibility of a break in diplomatic relations, Senator Bellegarde declared on the 1st of August, in the meeting of the Commissioners of the Exposition, that he intended to close the Russian section; but yielding to the entreaties of the committee of the exposition, he consented to postpone the closing to a later date, on condition that he should receive a guarantee that the objects exposed would run no risk, and that he himself and the members of the Russian Commission would be permitted to return to Russia without obstacle. These conditions were inserted in a *procès-verbal*, drawn up to this effect, which did not prevent the fact that on the 3d of August, at three o'clock, Senator Bellegarde and all the members of his commission were put under arrest in the Russian pavilion; then they were put into a prison for criminals, where they passed the night.

According to authentic information Prince Youssoupoff, Count Soumarokoff-Elstone, with his family, arrived in Berlin the day of the declaration of war. Almost on his heels a German officer presented himself at the hotel where the party had just taken rooms, and notified him that he and his son were prisoners of war. Hardly had the officer left the room when Her Highness Princess Irene Alexandrovna called by telephone the Princess Royal of Germany, her friend of long standing, and informed her of the arrest of her husband and of his father. The Princess Royal Cecilie answered that within an hour she would see the Emperor personally and would ask him to permit the two Princes Youssoupoff a free passage to the frontier.

More than an hour of anxious waiting passed by; at last the telephone bell rang. The endeavor of the Princess Royal had failed, for the reason that the order to arrest as prisoners of war Russians traveling in Germany emanated directly from the Emperor.

It was only through the kindness of the Ambassador

from Spain, who offered his automobile, that the Princes Youssoupoff and their family were able to go to the station, where they were admitted into the train of Her Majesty the Empress Marie Féodorovna, who was passing at that moment.

The Russian visitors were thrust into railway wagons devoted to the transport of stock, and from which often the manure had not yet been cleaned away. These unhappy people on their arrival in a city were crowded into stables, slaughter-houses (for example, at Stettin), pigpens, and in quarantine stations for animals. They were driven, women and children, old people and invalids, surrounded by soldiers, like a flock of cattle, at so rapid a pace, sometimes with arms held up (as at Königsberg), that the women fell to the ground exhausted with fatigue.

"We were utterly exhausted from hunger, and nights of sleeplessness — particularly the women and children," declares Vice-Admiral Tz. It is also self-evident that many were in no condition to walk fast enough to suit the soldiers. So they shoved them on with blows with sticks, fists, and even at the point of the bayonet. One old man lagged behind. *Bang!* came a blow with a club in his back, and he fell with a groan. Many women suffered nervous collapse. The children uttered heartrending cries; in short, it was a brutal spectacle. The populace stirred up the anger of the soldiers and the police by shouting incessantly to them: "Thrash them well, those Russian pigs; teach them to walk, those beasts!"

Here is a scene that took place: One gentleman, in the disorder of one of those "perquisitions" at the railroad station of Varnemünde, took, in his haste, a package. On the road he discovered that the package did not belong to him and threw it away. Having noticed the movement, one of the police set his dog upon the man, who jumped upon the unfortunate and went for his throat. Hardly a moment passed before man and dog were on the ground, the dog never slackening his hold on his prize. The man was torn to tatters, bitten in his face, and soon was covered with wounds. When at last the police officer troubled him-

self enough to come, upon hearing his cries, the man was literally torn to pieces.

I refrain from describing that which ensued. The women became insane, children threw themselves into the arms of any one who chanced to pass, begging for protection. Often these poor little ones appealed in this way to the police agents themselves; but they threw them off as if they had been dogs.

On all these marches (Allenstein, Rostock, etc.) the women and children were pushed into the railway carriages, with fisticuffs and blows from the butts of guns; often the members of a family were separated by force. Many persons lost their children.

The Russian travelers on these journeys were deprived of nourishment for many days in succession; the German authorities, even, at times, refused them drinking water. A group of Russians of about sixty persons during the journey of seventy hours between Allenstein, Danzig, and Stettin, were permitted only once to leave the carriage and were deprived of water to drink during this entire time. All these violences were accompanied by taunts, intimidations, continual threats, which produced a most crushing effect on the women and children and caused fainting spells, nervous attacks, and so forth.

It must be added that men, between the ages of eighty and fifteen years, were arrested as prisoners of war, and not only were they not permitted to take possession of their baggage, but to their mothers, wives, and sisters, who were in the greatest despair, they were forbidden to give necessary money and even to bid them good-bye. The larger pieces of baggage of all these unfortunates disappeared in the different German railway stations; while the hand-baggage of the Russians was often thrown out of the windows of the train by railway employees and by soldiers. In most cases the authorities and the officers did nothing but encourage the brutality of the soldiers toward the poor travelers, whom they maltreated in every fashion and whom they searched, even sometimes obliging them to undress completely.

A physician, Mr. Péréchivkine, assistant doctor of the clinic of the Military Academy of Medicine at Petrograd, who traveled on one of these trains, testifies that among the travelers were found persons suffering from diseases of the kidney and bladder, who had been obliged to break off their cure at Wildungen. On the 3d of August, during the journey from Allenstein to Marienburg, for fourteen hours, they were forbidden to leave the freight wagon in which they had been locked, men and women, to the number of more than forty persons, a hardship which caused them atrocious suffering, inevitable under such circumstances to invalids of this category.

"I saw one woman," tells V. Némirovitch-Dantchenko, the well-known Russian journalist, "who, in a moment of flurry, had lost the milk she had for her baby, kiss the feet of those brutes as she pleaded with them to give her little one something — even if it was only water. The brutes were so cruel as to show her from afar glasses of milk, laughing heartily at this subtle joke. The baby died a short time afterward, and the mother became insane. How would you depict scenes like that?"

"The most painful of all," Doctor N. S. P. told us, "was being deprived of nourishment, foods of all kinds, all sleep, and finally, the impossibility of satisfying natural wants for long periods at a time. Among us there were many invalids of both sexes, who had not been able to complete their cure which had been brutally interrupted in Germany, and who had constant needs. Their sufferings were horrible to see. I remember especially, an old man who writhed with convulsions. All his prayers that a part of the train be fenced off for him gave rise merely to coarse jokes on the part of the soldiers and the maid (*Dienstfrau*). Finally, being no longer in a condition to stand his intolerable sufferings the passengers, aided by those who still owned some baggage, built of them a sort of screen in a corner of the train which they made into an improvised dress-

ing-room. It was painful to see the women and young girls. We feigned to sleep, or tried to turn away as well as we could, so as not to embarrass them too much. Such were the conditions in which they held us in our trains for more than twenty-four hours."

V. Némirovitch-Dantchenko reports that a group of women, who were going toward the frontier, traveled twenty-four hours without a break. As one cannot overcome nature, and as in the cattle cars into which they had been herded there were naturally no lavatories, the women begged that they might be allowed to leave the cars for a moment. The guards mocked them coarsely. Many were ill; there were women who fainted; but it was in vain that the Russian "prisoners" appealed to the Germans, drunk with cruelty, who had lost all humane instincts.

The penal administration treated the Russians as criminals in common law, ordering that the punishment reserved for such be applied to them in all its force.

Arrest of Mr. Shébéko, member of the Imperial Council, and "visit" of the women

The repatriation of a group of thirty-six Russians — women for the greater part — from Baden-Baden and other watering-places in southern Germany is related in a communication from the agency at Petrograd dated at Copenhagen, on the 29th of July.

In this group were found the Countess Worontzoff-Dachkoff, wife of the Vice-Regent of the Caucasus, accompanied by her daughters, the Countesses Cheremetieff and Démidoff; Mme. Podiedonostseff, the Countess Orloff-Davydoff, the Squire of the Court, Baron Wolf, and the Squire Baron Knorring, former Minister at Darmstadt, who was traveling with his family.

As far as Frankfurt, the journey was carried out normally. Between Frankfurt and Hamburg, when the train was full to overflowing of civilians and of soldiers, the Russians were arrested by the military authorities. All were

obliged to alight with their baggage, three stations before reaching Hamburg.

It was only upon the insistence of Baron Knorring that they were allowed to continue their journey to the principal station at Hamburg. There under military escort they were all brought before the station guard, where their passports were verified and their baggage examined; after this they were directed to the Atlantic Hotel, where, in consequence of lack of trains, they were obliged to remain until Friday evening. At Hamburg, Shébéko, member of the Council of the Empire, joined the company. As far as Neuminster the journey was again carried out without incident; but at this station Mr. Shébéko was arrested on a telegram from Berlin, and was forcibly removed from the train. This incident caused the greatest excitement among the Russians, which marked them to the public, who had invaded the station, and who behaved in an insane manner; the most ferocious among them appeared to be nurses and Sisters of Charity. The Countess Worontzoff-Dachkoff was subjected to serious outrage; she had gone into the compartment next door to her own to announce the arrest of Mr. Shébéko when the crowd began to cry, "That woman is trying to conceal something," and demanded that she be searched.

Thereupon some drunken soldiers of the Landwehr, with cigars in their mouths, climbed into the carriage, drove the Countess out of it by the butts of their guns, and began to search her upon the platform in the grossest manner, pulling her by her hair and by her garments. The crowd, seized by a wild dementia, howled and stamped their feet, preventing the train from leaving; laborious interviews were required to set things in motion again. Baron Knorring, however, having shown the passport and ticket of Mr. Shébéko to the station-master, the latter replied that even without those documents the Russians would meet with too few difficulties, and that he would do all he could to further inconvenience their journey.

As to Mr. Shébéko, he began by remaining several hours at the station at Neuminster under the guard of soldiers

with bared bayonets, surrounded by a maddened mob which incessantly shouted, "Shoot him!" After these long and difficult hours of waiting, Mr. Shébéko was sent to a prison for common criminals; on his arrival his money and all objects of value in his possession were taken from him, and he was confined in an isolated cell. There he remained twenty-four hours, at the end of which time he was set at liberty and even obtained, on his request, a bodyguard of soldiers to accompany him as far as the Danish frontier. We cannot too much insist upon the fact that in arresting the Councillor of the Empire, Mr. Shébéko, or in "visiting" in an outrageous manner the wife of the Viceroy of the Caucasus, the Countess Worontzoff-Dachkoff, the Germans knew perfectly well with whom they were dealing, and were quite certain to find in the possession of these high personages no document of interest to them.

When one hears of all the sufferings undergone by the unfortunate Russian travelers in Germany, one is not astonished at the communication of the Telegraph Agency at Petrograd of August 8, according to which "the Swedish hospitals were filled with Russians, wounded, suffering from contusions, or ill as a result of the horrible treatment suffered at the hands of Germany." Added to the physical sufferings were also the moral sufferings due to the uncertainty of the fate which might befall the Russians at any minute, or worry as to the lot of dear ones from whom they had been separated in the course of their journey.

Even persons seriously ill were submitted to the same cruel treatment. Thus, Mme. Tougan-Baranovski, wife of the Director of the Chancellery of the Minister of the Lines of Communication, who had just undergone a very serious operation, was attacked at Breslau by the crowd, who tore the dressings from her head. She was then put in prison. At the end of three days she was obliged to walk the whole length of the city, with a great number of her compatriots, to the station of Oderbanhof, where they were packed into coal cars, still full of detritus. On the 5th of August, all these unfortunates were abandoned to their fate, not far from Verouchoff on the Russian frontier, which

they were obliged to reach on foot. On the 13th of August Mme. Tougan-Baranovski died at Petrograd, where she had been taken in a desperate condition.

As we have already said, all the facts related above have been carefully verified and certified, either by the complainants themselves, or by eye-witnesses of all these atrocities. Besides the names already cited, we will mention among others the following persons: Senator Count Pahlen; Mr. Ivanoff, Senator and President of the Municipal Council at Petrograd; Prince Ouroussoff, editor-in-chief of the "Journal Officiel"; M. Sventitsky, member of the Duma of the Empire; M. Schwartz, Chamberlain and Marshal of the Nobility of the district of Novaia Ladoga; Prince P. A. Ouroussoff and his wife; Baron L. Knorring, Squire of the Court; M. Hirschmann, engineer; Lieutenant-General von Beck; Councillor of the State, Kalatcheff; Princess Oukhtomsky, Maid of Honor to Her Majesty the Empress; Councillor of State Khovansky; the gentleman of the Chamber of His Majesty the Emperor, Pistolkors, and his wife; Count and Countess Kankrine; Mme. Démidoff; Princess San Donato; Countess Orloff-Davidoff; Mr. Pleske, and many others.

When the first Russian travelers who had returned from Germany recounted the atrocities which they had suffered, their stories seemed so fantastic that Russian opinion could not at first consent to believe them. We were accustomed to look upon the Germans as a civilized nation and it seemed to us impossible that this entire people should have fallen morally so low that it presented the appearance of a horde of indigenous brutes, assassins, and plunderers.

"I cannot explain," said to us Mr. N. S. P—kin, a doctor of medicine, "this sudden change in the character of the German people. I made my studies in Germany, I lived a long time in that country, and I was profoundly convinced that the Germans were a people of high civilization."

This belief was shared by the larger part of Russian opinion, unfortunately; it was therefore to us a particularly rude and unexpected blow dealt by this explosion of

stupid rage and systematic cruelty which, at the first word of war, shook the entire Empire of Germany from one end to the other, at the command, so to speak, of her Emperor, whose hand clearly appears in the beginning of what history has already qualified by an ineffaceable word: "The German infamy."

Experiences of invalids in German and Austrian health resorts

In a letter to the editor of the "Vetcherneie Vremya" of the 4th of August, the wife of the engineer T. Tz. writes: —

> On the day of the declaration of war, all my compatriots who were in the establishment were despoiled of all they possessed by the directors themselves. Taking advantage of the hour when the Russian invalids had gone out to take their air baths, Dr. Lipeld-Kota, with his employees, entered the bedrooms and there indulged in a regular appropriation of goods. Money, watches, rings, jewels, everything that had been left there, was seized, and when the invalids returned, the doctor had them ejected from the establishment with the aid of the servants. Many were without a sou and were only able to leave Friedrichrod thanks to the assistance of those of their compatriots who more providently had carried their money with them. They were obliged to depart dressed as they were, for the doctor even refused to restore any clothing.

Mr. S. V. Tchelnokoff, member of the Municipality of Moscow, declares that at Carlsbad the sending of letters through the mail was broken off on the 14th of July. Certain letters were purely and simply intercepted; others were returned to the senders, inscribed, "Not subject to transmission."

The delivery of the sums called for by postal money orders coming from Russia, to those for whom they were intended, was suspended, in Austria as well as in Germany, several days before the declaration of war.

Mme. E. I. Godlevska reports that during the seven days

which preceded Austria's declaration of war upon Serbia, being at Carlsbad, she received none of the postal and telegraphic money orders which had been sent her from Russia, so that when the police decided upon the expulsion of the Russians who were in the city, she was absolutely without money. It was only thanks to the friendliness of her companions in misfortune that, sick and exhausted, she was able to find her way back to Petrograd.

Regions devastated at the retirement of the Germans

Here is the report of the Governor of Kholm (Chelm) to the Minister of the Interior on the state of the district of Tomachoff after its evacuation by the Austrian hordes: —

In the Commune Krinitzka, out of fourteen villages, eleven suffered by fire and pillage. In this commune, sixty-five houses were burned, thirty-five in the village of Maidan-Krinitz, and eighteen in the village of Maidan-Seletz. In this last village twelve persons were burned alive by the Austrians; the victims had sheltered themselves from shells by hiding in a hole dug in the earth for this special purpose. The Austrians threw burning straw into this hole, and standing all about it in a circle, they prevented all from coming out by driving them back at the point of the bayonet.

In the village of Maidan-Krinitz, four persons, two of them children, were shot. Besides, in the course of a fusillade, five persons were killed and six wounded; and finally, fourteen were taken away as hostages and their ultimate fate has not been established.

In the commune Tarnovatka, out of twelve villages, ten were devastated. In the entire commune, one hundred and forty-one inhabitants were carried away by the enemy; among them was the secretary of the commune; of these unfortunates nine came back to their villages and six were killed. The Catholics who had been made prisoners were set at liberty at Tomachoff; the Orthodox were retained;

what became of them is not known. According to the testimony of those who returned, the prisoners were very ill-treated by the enemy. In the villages of Gouta and of Véprie Ozéro the Austrians violated women. In the village of Soumine, according to the testimony of the curé of the parish of Tarnovatka, a woman who resisted was killed and the ears and the breasts were cut from the corpse. In the village of Tarnovatka, thirty-three houses were burned, but there the fire seems to have been set by the artillery firing. In other villages of the same commune cases of the voluntary burning of houses have been established. The portrait of the Emperor was destroyed and all the archives have disappeared; the lodgings of the priests and of the schoolmaster were plundered.

In the commune Yarchovska the large village of Ioroff on the frontier, reputed for its opulence, was entirely burned. The church and the school alone escaped, because behind these buildings the fire had raged with such violence that the trees which surrounded the church were consumed. Here, as at Maidan-Seletz, the inhabitants took refuge during the battle in holes and in cellars, and they also were victims of the savagery of the enemy. Forty-eight inhabitants perished, and three, including a boy eight years old, were wounded; five were taken away as hostages.

The peasants are unanimous in testifying that the village was voluntarily burned by the Austrian soldiers after the battle had ended.

The pretext of this measure, as well as of other atrocities committed by the Austrians, was the accusation against the populace of having fired on the Austrian troops, while in reality it was the Austrian soldiers themselves who purposely fired provocative shots.

In the village of Verechtchzi, out of seventy-six houses, fifty-four were burned, and six heavily damaged by fires voluntarily lighted by the Austrians. The conditions were exactly the same as at Ioroff; the fire was lighted after the battle on the lying pretext that shots had been fired on the Austrian soldiers from the peasants' cabins. The soldiers lighted the fire in almost every cottage, carefully, with

matches, and also by gunshots, and in this latter case they used special cartridges containing, instead of powder, a stuffing of material easily inflammable. Cartridges of this kind have been found among the munitions taken from the enemy or abandoned by him. They differ from ordinary cartridges by their lightness and by the black or red head of the stuffing.

German atrocities — a Russian indictment

I make some extracts from official reports of the Extraordinary Commission appointed on the initiative of the Russian State Duma to investigate "breaches of the laws and usages of war committed by the Austro-Hungarian and German troops": —

They [the prisoners] are harnessed to the plough together with oxen and put into the shafts of heavy carts or wagons to drag enormous loads. They are punished in the roughest and harshest manner possible for the slightest disobedience, or for not doing the proper thing, and this often happens simply through ignorance of the German language. They are put on bread and water, forced to run until exhausted, hung up, or lashed by arms and legs to a post for a couple of hours. This has often resulted in putting arms and legs out of joint, and in one known case, the victim, when released, fell down insensible and did not recover for three hours. Prisoners have also been compelled to kneel on sharp pieces of broken brick. Besides this kind of punishment, they have had to submit to insult and mockery from the enemy, and have been made sport of by both Germans and Austrians. They have been beaten, worried by dogs, and kept half starved, whilst being compelled to look on at their captors enjoying excellent meals.

A reserve man of the first category, named Shimchak, who was interned in one of the camps for prisoners, was an eye-witness of the torturing of four Cossacks in the following manner: The Germans took the first Cossack, placed his left hand on a not very high post, and with a sword bayonet

chopped off half of his middle finger, half of his thumb, and then half of his little finger. These severed finger pieces the Germans thrust into the pocket of the mutilated Cossack, and led him away; the second Cossack had his ears pierced, the third his nose cut off, and the fourth Cossack, seeing the sufferings of his comrades, snatched a bayonet from one of the Germans and struck him with it. This Cossack was at once bayoneted by all the German soldiers on the spot.

For three days in succession German officers tormented an under-officer of Cossacks named Zinoviev by applying electricity to his legs in order to compel him to give information, and on the fourth day one of the German officers burnt the soles of Zinoviev's feet with a red-hot iron.

A soldier named Yasinsky saw the dead body of a Cossack with eyes put out, half of the tongue cut off, the fingers dislocated, and strips of skin torn from the chest and back.

"In addition," the reports adds, the Germans have "contracted the habit of burning prisoners." Eighteen cases of the kind have been under inquiry, and two where, in the one instance in February, 1915, in Novi Dvor, and in the other in September, 1914, at Opadkovits, "Russian wounded soldiers were shut up and burnt to death," have already been authenticated.

Near the town of Prasnish, some German troopers arrested a native from the village of Smoshevo, in the province of Plotsk, named Joseph Franz Maximilianov Fliashchinsky, sixty three years of age, and because he refused to act the spy for their benefit they tortured him by first binding his arms to a plank. He was then thrown face downward, the plank to which his arms were attached was fastened to the ground with wooden pegs, and his legs were tied together. In this position the Germans covered him with boughs and pine-tree fronds, which they set fire to, and then they went away. Fliashchinsky, however, managed to release himself and get up, thanks to the accidental burning through of the rope.

At the end of last December, near a village in East Prussia, one of our troopers, through want of caution, was taken

prisoner, while foraging, by a party of eight Germans, who stripped him naked, drove him to the wood pile which they had just set alight, and began to roast him over the fire. They surrounded him and the burning fagots, and with their rifles they kept him on the spot at the point of the bayonet. Neither his cries for mercy nor the harrowing spectacle of a human creature being burned alive had any effect in softening the feelings of his executioners.

The Germans in Czenstochow

The "Pensée de Varsovie" reports the story of the prior of the monastery of Czenstochow to the Metropolitan of the Roman Catholic Churches, Klioutchinski, about the excesses committed by the Germans in the monastery: —

> At the time of their entry at Czenstochow, the Germans called upon the prior and demanded money. Having received a refusal, they spoiled the ikon of the Virgin of its golden nimbus encrusted with diamonds, the present of a Roman pope to the monastery, and they carried away the precious cross presented in olden times by Sigismond.
>
> On the next day the terrible news spread through the Polish populace of Czenstochow that the German soldiers had indulged in a scandalous orgy during the night in the monastery of Iasnogor. At nightfall, therefore, a patrol of German cavalry, five in number, passing near the monastery received the fire of a group of Polish "partisans." Three German soldiers were killed. When at the sound of firing a detachment of German cavalry came to the rescue, the Polish "partisans" had secured their flight. Furiously the Germans then began to fire in every direction in the streets of the city.
>
> Among the riches perserved in the monastery of Czenstochow, there were thousands of pounds of silver and of gold, the offerings of pilgrims; a great quantity of pearls, of diamonds and of precious stones adorned the frame and the nimbus of the celebrated ikon.

Among these stones there were some of great rarity and of inestimable value; notably a pearl presented by the Chancellor Prince Lioubomirski, which he had received from the Turkish Ambassador; a giant ruby taken from the handle of a yatagan, taken by King John Sobiesky before Vienna; an emerald weighing more than three hundred karats, presented by an unknown person, who in 1812 had laid it in the contribution box.

Now all these treasures have been stolen by the Germans. Emperor William is well aware that the Monastery of Iasnogor is a center of pilgrimages for the Poles.

The orgy mentioned in the monastery of Iasnogor, was related in a specially poignant manner by Mlle. Hélène S., a young girl of nineteen who succeeded in escaping from Czenstochow, and had just arrived at Petrograd. This is her story: —

Scarcely had the Germans crossed the frontier when reports of incredible atrocities began to come to us. Peasants who had been robbed, pillaged, and ruined, fled to the city, coming from every direction in mad flight, while from mouth to mouth circulated stories horrible enough to raise the hair upon our heads. Meantime, however, we remained absolutely calm, persuaded that because of its ancient relics our city had nothing to fear.

The first German detachments entered about three o'clock in the morning and encamped near the monastery; but not a man stepped inside the monastery. Meanwhile the officers were circulating in the streets, marking with chalk on each door the number of soldiers to be lodged there. In the street the conduct of the men became revolting; they caught and embraced the women and under the pretense of searching them, indulged in the grossest familiarities.

The populace, however, bore everything in absolute silence and with perfect self-possession, since we were

still convinced that the holy places would not be profaned. We were firmly resolved to bear courageously every violence and every vexation if only our monastery might be saved!

At two in the afternoon the Germans demanded that the doors of the monastery should be opened to them, which was immediately done, and the commander surrounded by his officers and escorted by a little group of soldiers, disappeared within it. The day was relatively calm. Towards eight o'clock in the evening a few officers, accompanied by soldiers, visited the houses in search of women, under the pretext that they were required for different tasks and for the installation of bedchambers to be carried out in the interior of the monastery. They evidently selected the youngest and the prettiest. Having no suspicion of the infamous project of the Germans, no one made the least resistance. There were even young girls of the best houses, who expressed a desire to go and work in the venerated monastery!

I was among those whom the Germans appointed to serve. We were divided into groups of ten. The first group, in which was my mother, was sent immediately to the monastery; the second followed about two hours later, and towards one o'clock in the morning it was the turn of the third group of which I was a member. When we came into the monastery, the first thing that surprised us was to hear the sounds of a military band, which came to us distinctly, but we were certainly still far from guessing the truth!

We were led into quite a spacious cell, and commanded to wait.

Two soldiers began to importune us, and they interrupted us in a menacing fashion when we began to talk together in Polish. At the end of half an hour soldiers came in rolling into the cell a cask of wine, and bringing glasses. At the same time an officer came in and with difficulty said to us in Polish: "A heavy labor is before you; you must take indispensable strength for it." Say-

ing these words he began to laugh and rudely pinched one of my companions. In the mean time the soldiers had filled the glasses with wine. We were forced to drink it.

When I refused to drink the wine offered me, at a sign from the officer two soldiers seized me by my arms and held my head backwards while a third poured the wine down my throat. The Germans had certainly mixed some drug with the wine, for all of us as soon as we had drunk were seized with vertigo. Then they forced us to leave the cell, either one at a time or in groups of two. When my turn came, I tried to resist; but the soldiers picked me up under my arms and carried me across the corridor. . . . I then lost consciousness.

When I came home on the next morning, I found my mother in her bed, without consciousness; she was in a prolonged swoon. I endeavored to bring her to herself again, but every time she fell back in a faint. . . .

She had undergone the same violence as I. . . . I decided to leave home to come here to my sister's house, for after what had happened, my mother and I could no longer look each other in the face.

The Polish population, the immense majority of which is profoundly religious, was thunderstruck to learn how the Germans had behaved towards the miraculous ikon of the Virgin, the object of all the Catholic pilgrimages, and throughout the city there was a state of unspeakable moral depression. Certain ones proposed to carry out a general mourning. The women immediately adopted this idea; that very evening they were all clothed in black.

The Germans themselves, told everywhere, how "joyously they had passed the night" at the monastery. It is related also in the city, that at the end of the orgy in the monastery, the Germans, after having done violence to the women, had also offered the basest insults to the members of the clergy who were among the hostages and of whom was the prior of the monastery of Iasnogor.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TRAGEDY OF ARMENIA: THE TURKISH METHODS OF SPOLIATION, DEPORTATION AND MASSACRE

In this terrible war, like no other in its horrors and destructions, there is one tragedy which stands alone; that is, the robbery, deportation, and massacre of the Armenians. A million and a half people, from helpless infancy to helpless old age, have been robbed and tortured, deprived of home and estate, and half of them have died under circumstances of appalling atrocity and cruelty.

With the success of the Young Turks in 1908, a new idea came to the predatory minority that rule and rob Turkey. It was "Turkey for the Turks." It was not the result of religious fanaticism, although it brought into play the fanatical passions of the masses of Mohammedans, but on the part of the Government it was largely for spoliation and power.

I asked Talaat Bey, March 10, 1916, how many Armenians had been expelled at that time. He said about eight hundred thousand. His estimate was too low. I talked with former Turkish officials, some of whom had resigned rather than carry out the orders against the Armenians. What I learned from these officials simply proved the accuracy of the innumerable reports from Europeans, including consuls, merchants, traders, agents of large concerns, missionaries, and travelers. It is as impossible to conceal happenings in Asia Minor as it would be in New York State.

We are to conceive a territory nearly one fifth as large as the United States. In this territory, mingling with the other races, Greeks, Turks, etc., are the Armenian people. The Armenians are energetic and intelligent, with a long history, a considerable literature, and a highly developed national consciousness. Generally they are prosperous. Many are people of wealth and refinement — all suffered alike.

The Armenian nation existed many hundred years before the invasion of the Turks. The policy of the invading Turks was not to destroy or remove the peoples of the nations they invaded, but to exploit them, for the Turkish Government is simply a criminal organization to rob.

It is almost impossible to visualize the new Turkish methods. While I can find no parallel in history to the fate of the Armenians, — and at this moment they are in the midst of their crucifixion, — I learned of an incident in Constantinople somewhat similar. Some years ago the authorities of Constantinople decided to get rid of the vast number of dogs that occupied every street. Instead of killing them outright they removed the dogs to an island on the Sea of Marmora, not far from the city, where there was neither food nor water. All the dogs perished miserably. An American in Constantinople showed me a photograph of the last dog, standing on a rock, looking toward Constantinople.

Here is the story of eighteen thousand exiles who all perished, excepting one hundred and eighty-five, and excepting some of the girls who had suffered a fate worse than death.

The Story of Eighteen Thousand Exiles in One Caravan[1]

On the 1st day of June three thousand people, mostly women, girls, and children, left Harput, accompanied by seventy policemen.

The third day the caravan of exiles reached Tootlykeuy. There the Arabs and Kurds began to steal the women and girls till they reached the first railway station of Rasulain on the Bagdad line.

On the fifteenth day they were again treading their way through the steep mountains, where the Kurds gathered one hundred and fifty of the men, aged from fifteen to ninety, and taking them to some distance butchered them and came back and began to rob the people.

That day another caravan of exiles, only three hundred of whom were men, from Sivas, Egin, Tokat, joined that from Harput, thus making a bigger caravan, eighteen thousand all counted (almost all women, girls, and children). They started on the seventeenth day under the protection of another Kurd bey. This bey called out his people, who attacked the caravan and robbed them.

The twenty-fifth day they reached the village of Geulik, all the inhabitants of which went a long way with the caravan, tormenting and robbing them. The thirty-second day they were at the village of Kekhteh. Here they remained two days, and again many girls and women were stolen.

On the fortieth day the caravan saw the river Mourad, a branch of the Euphrates.

The chief of the village near by tolled one lira (five dollars) from each man as a ransom for not being thrown into the river.

On the fifty-second day they arrived at another village. Here the Kurds took from them everything they had, even their shirts and drawers, and for five days the whole caravan

[1] It has been necessary to suppress the names of writers for the purpose of protecting them.

walked *all naked* under the scorching sun. For another five days they did not have a morsel of bread, neither a drop of water. They were scorched to death by thirst.

Hundreds on hundreds fell dead on the way, their tongues were turned to charcoal, and when at the end of the fiftieth day they reached a fountain the whole caravan naturally rushed to it, but the policemen stood in front of them and forbade them to take even a drop of water, for they wanted to sell the water from one to three lire (five dollars to fifteen dollars) the cup, and sometimes even not giving the water after getting the money.

When they came near an Arab village in that naked state, the Arabs pitied them and gave them old pieces of clothes to be covered with. Some of the exiles who had money left bought some clothes. But there were still some left who came in that naked state up to the city of Haleb. The poor women could not walk for shame; they walked all bent forward.

In this naked state they had found some ways to keep the little money they had. Some kept it in their hair, some in their mouths. And when the robbers attacked them some were clever enough to search for money in those secret places, and that in a very beastly manner, of course.

On the sixtieth day, when we reached the Viran Shehir, only three hundred had remained from the eighteen thousand exiles. On the sixty-fourth day they gathered all the men and the sick women and children and burned and killed them all. Those remaining were ordered to continue their way.

On the seventieth day, when they reached Haalep, one hundred and eighty-five women and children were remaining from the whole caravan of eighteen thousand.

The above is a typical story of the experiences of the deported Armenians. Each of the seventy days had its tragedies. I have selected only a few days. The tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands who are expelled from their homes undergo similar treatment.

There are twenty colleges among the Armenians, established by Americans. I have visited some of these colleges, and have many times addressed the students. I have never found more intelligent or more refined or better appearing college students in any American college. The buildings and the courses of study remind one of the typical American college found all over the United States. They might be in Illinois or California. The teaching faculties include many men and women who have been educated in Germany, England, or the United States. The colleges form little oases of America.

I give typical narratives of experiences in some of these institutions. It must be understood that it is the teachers of Armenian nationality who suffer.

Town of H.: Statement by the Principal of the College, dated 19th July, 1915; communicated by the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief

I shall try to banish from my mind for the time the sense of great personal sorrow at losing hundreds of my friends here, and also my sense of utter defeat in being so unable to stop the awful tragedy or even mitigate to any degree its severity, and compel myself to give you concisely some of the cold facts of the past months, as they relate themselves to the College. I do so with the hope that the possession of these concrete facts may help you to do something there for the handful of dependents still left to us here.

Buildings. Seven of our big buildings are in the hands of the Government, only one remaining in our hands. The seven buildings in question are empty, except for twenty guards who are stationed there. I cannot tell you exactly the amount of loss we have sustained in money by robberies, breakages, and other means, and there is no sign that the Turks will ever return these buildings to us.

Constituency. Approximately two thirds of the girl pupils and six sevenths of the boys have been taken away to death, exile, or Moslem homes.

Professors. Four gone, three left, as follows: —

Professor A. Served College thirty-five years; representative of the Americans with the Government; Protestant, Professor of Turkish and History. Besides previous trouble, arrested May 1 without charge; hair of head, mustache and beard pulled out, in vain effort to secure damaging confessions; starved and hung by arms for a day and a night, and severely beaten several times; taken out towards Diyarbekir about June 20, and murdered in general massacre on the road.

Professor B. Served College thirty-three years; studied at Ann Arbor; Professor of Mathematics. Arrested about June 5, and shared Professor A.'s fate on the road.

Professor C. Taken to witness a man beaten almost to death; became mentally deranged; started with his family about July 5 into exile under guard, and murdered beyond Malatia. Principal of Preparatory Department; studied at Princeton; served College twenty years.

Professor D. Served College sixteen years; studied at Edinburgh; Professor of Mental and Moral Science. Arrested with Professor A. and suffered same tortures; also had three finger nails pulled out by the roots; killed in same massacre.

Professor E. Served College twenty-five years. Arrested May 1; not tortured, but sick in prison; sent to Red Crescent Hospital, and after paying large bribes is now free.

Professor F. Served College for over fifteen years; studied in Stuttgart and Berlin; Professor of Music. Escaped arrest and torture, and thus far escaped exile and death, because of favor with the Kaimakam secured by personal services rendered.

Professor G. Served College about fifteen years; studied at Cornell and Yale (M.S.); Professor of Biology. Arrested about June 5; beaten about the hands, body, and head with a stick by the Kaimakam himself, who, when tired, called on all who loved religion and the nation to continue the beat-

ing; after a period of insensibility in a dark closet, taken to the Red Crescent Hospital with a broken finger and serious bruises. Now free.

Instructors, male. Four, whose average term of service is eight years, reported killed on the road in various massacres. Three not heard from, probably killed on the road; average term of service in the College, four years. Two sick in the American Hospital. One elsewhere. One, engaged in cabinet work for the Kaimakam, free. One, owner of house occupied by the Kaimakam, free.

Instructors, female. One reported killed in F.; served the College over twenty years. One reported taken to a Turkish harem. Three not heard from. Four started out as exiles. Ten free.

Total loss. About seven eighths of the buildings, three quarters of the students, and half the teaching staff.

Of the Armenian people as a whole we may estimate that three fourths are gone, and this three fourths includes the leaders in every walk of life — merchants, professional men, preachers, bishops and government officials.

I have said enough. Our hearts are sick with these sights and stories of abject terror and suffering. The extermination of the race seems to be the object, and the means employed are more fiendish than could be concocted locally. The orders are from headquarters, and any reprieve must be from the same source. All the Armenian young men in the town were arrested and terrorized by infernal torments.

The majority of the young Armenians who were treated in this way were pupils of the American College, the French College, and the Central Armenian School.

In July all Armenian families of any standing in G. were compelled to emigrate. The arrests of the young men had been effected at night-time, but the deportation of these wealthy families was carried out in full daylight.

These individuals were taken a distance of twenty kilometres and then slaughtered without pity, like cattle, on the banks of a river and their corpses thrown into the water. As for the rest, the men were separated from the women and

cruelly murdered by blows of the axe. The women and girls were carried off by the Kurds and Turks.

All the professors and schoolmasters were also imprisoned and subsequently assassinated, at the same time as the young men. Those, however, who were connected with German institutions were happily excepted.

Mamouret-ul-Aziz

Shortly after last Easter (1915), the Turkish officials searched the Armenian churches and schools of G., H., C., AQ., AR., AS., and the surrounding villages, but without finding anything incriminating.

After that, they arrested from the town of C. the following persons; Professor B., Mr. H. and his brother J., Mr. O. and his son P., Mr. Q., the brothers R., the brothers S., and T. Effendi, as well as many others, old and young. They took them to the house of V. Agha, stripped them one by one and gave them three hundred lashes on their backs. When they fainted, they threw them into a stable and waited until they had revived, in order to beat them again.

After beating T. Effendi in H., and tearing out his finger nails and the flesh of his hands and feet, they put a rope under his arms, dragged him to C., and threw him into prison. Then they entered his house, and, on the pretense of searching it, made his wife, who was in indifferent health, lie on the ground; a soldier sat on her, and they began to beat her on her feet, asking her where they had hidden their arms. After a few days her husband died in the prison.

In C. they beat many young men to get their arms, so that they were obliged to buy arms from the Turks and give them to the Government.

They plucked out the hair and nails of some of the professors. They dug out their eyes and branded them with red-hot irons, so that some of them died immediately, and others first lost their reason and died thereafter.

The Bishop of H., C.J., and other prominent Armenians were imprisoned and suffered many cruelties.

At Aleppo

At Aleppo were the remnants of five thousand exiles who had started from Kharput. Among them were many intelligent and refined young women who had graduated from Constantinople College and the Euphrates College. Their treatment at the hands of the gendarmes, and their fate as occupants of harems, are almost unthinkable. When the refugees came to cross the rivers that flow into the Euphrates, the able-bodied men were drowned. Further on, the survivors, now only old men, women, and children, were stripped of all their clothing. Naked, they waded through streams, slept in the chilly nights, and bore the heat of the sun. They were brought into Aleppo for the last few miles in third-class railway carriages, herded together like so many animals. When the doors of the carriages were opened they were jeered at by the populace for their nakedness. Of the five thousand that had started from Kharput only two hundred and thirteen were left!

Marash

In Marash an orphanage had to be given up to the Turks, who turned it over to men. Its occupants were girls and young women, made orphans by the massacres of 1909 and preceding years. Many of them were cultured young women. The condition of those not yet dead is worse than death itself. In a German orphanage at Marash there were more than one thousand girls. The order for expatriation came, and, in order that she might shield a few of the older girls, the head mistress kept them under her own protection. Soon there came a telegram from the German Consul at Aleppo, saying: "You have hidden some girls. You have no business to do such a thing. Give them up." The girls had to be given up, and were taken away to suffer the inevitable at the hands of their Turkish masters. This so angered the head mistress that she went to Constantinople to protest to the German Ambassador. She tried repeatedly to interview him on the subject, but failed every time. She was told curtly

that it was none of her business. Broken-hearted, she returned to do what little relief work might be possible.

The following document gives the results of the deportations in certain provinces. Although limited to the provinces known to the writer of the document, he describes the general result of the deportations and massacres.

One Turkish official, who was worn out with the work of deportation, remarked that the work in Turkey was different from such work in Europe, for all the officials had to do there was to put people on trains and send them away!

Results of deportations in certain provinces

It is now established that there is not an Armenian left in the provinces of Erzeroum, Trebizond, Sivas, Harput, Bitlis, and Diyarbekir. About a million of the Armenian inhabitants of these provinces have been deported from their homes and sent southwards into exile. These deportations have been carried out very systematically by the local authorities since the beginning of April last. First of all, in every village and every town the population was disarmed by the gendarmerie, and by criminals released for this purpose from prison. On the pretext of disarming the Armenians, these criminals committed assassinations and inflicted hideous tortures. . . . The highest official, as well as the most simple peasant, chose out the woman or girl who caught his fancy, and took her to wife, converting her by force to Islam. As for the children the Moslems took as many of them as they wanted, and then the remnant of the Armenians were marched away, famished and destitute of provisions, to fall victims to hunger, unless that were anticipated by the savagery of the brigand bands. In the province of Diyarbekir there was an outright massacre, especially at Mardin, and the population was subjected to all the aforementioned atrocities. . . .

The Armenian soldiers too, have suffered the same fate. They were also all disarmed and put to constructing roads. We have certain knowledge that the Armenian soldiers of the province of Erzeroum, who were at work on the road from Erzeroum to Erzindjan, have all been massacred. The Armenian soldiers of the province of Diyarbekir have all been massacred on the Diyarbekir-Durfa road, and the Diyarbekir-Harput road. From Harput alone, eighteen hundred young Armenians were enrolled and sent off to work at Diyarbekir; all were massacred in the neighborhood of Arghana. We have no news from the other districts, but they have assuredly suffered the same fate there also.

The following extracts are from authenticated documents. They are typical of the whole mass of documents, and do not exaggerate the impression one gets if he examines all the data: —

Bitlis, Moush, and Sassoun

The shortest method for disposing of the women and children concentrated in the various camps was to burn them. Fire was set to large wooden sheds in Alidjan, Megrakon, Khaskegh, and other Armenian villages, and these absolutely helpless women and children were roasted to death. Many went mad and threw their children away; some knelt down and prayed amid the flames in which their bodies were burning; others shrieked and cried for help which came from nowhere. And the executioners, who seem to have been unmoved by this unparalleled savagery, grasped infants by one leg and hurled them into the fire, calling out to the burning mothers: "Here are your lions." Turkish prisoners who had apparently witnessed some of these scenes were horrified and maddened at remembering the sight. They told the Russians that the stench of the burning human flesh permeated the air for many days after.

Moush district

All the old women and the weak who were unable to walk were killed. There were about one hundred Kurdish guards over us, and our lives depended on their pleasure. It was a very common thing for them to rape our girls in our presence. Very often they violated eight- or ten- year-old girls, and as a consequence many would be unable to walk, and were shot.

Baibourt

The worst and most unimaginable horrors were reserved for us at the banks of the Euphrates and in the Erzindjan plain. The mutilated bodies of women, girls, and little children made everybody shudder. The brigands were doing all sorts of awful deeds to the women and girls that were with us, whose cries went up to heaven. At the Euphrates, the brigands and gendarmes threw into the river all the remaining children under fifteen years old. Those that could swim were shot down as they struggled in the water.

Report of July 11, 1915 from H.

On the Monday many men were arrested, both at H. and S., and put in prison.

On the Wednesday morning they were taken to a valley a few hours distant, where they were all made to sit down. Then the gendarmes began shooting them, until they had killed nearly all of them. Some who had not been killed by bullets were then disposed of with knives and bayonets. Among those who were killed was the treasurer of the College. Many other estimable men were among the number. [Extract.]

Trebizond

On Saturday, the 26th June, the proclamation regarding the deportation of all Armenians was posted in the streets.

The weeping and wailing of the women and children was

most heartrending. Some of these people were from wealthy and refined circles. Some were accustomed to luxury and ease. There were clergymen, merchants, bankers, lawyers mechanics, tailors, and men from every walk of life.

The whole Mohammedan population knew that these people were to be their prey from the beginning, and they were treated as criminals.

The best-looking of the older girls, who were retained as caretakers in these orphanages, are kept in houses for the pleasure of members of the gang which seems to rule affairs here. I hear on good authority that a member of the Committee of Union and Progress here has ten of the handsomest girls in a house in the central part of the city, for the use of himself and his friends.

Trebizond: Extracts from an interview with Comm. G. Gorrini, late Italian Consul-General at Trebizond, published in the Journal "Il Messaggero," of Rome, 25th August, 1915

From the 24th June, the date of the publication of the infamous decree, until the 23d July, the date of my own departure from Trebizond, I no longer slept or ate; I was given over to nerves and nausea, so terrible was the torment of having to look on at the wholesale execution of these defenseless, innocent creatures.

The passing of the gangs of Armenian exiles beneath the windows and before the door of the Consulate; their prayers for help, when neither I nor any other could do anything to answer them; the city in a state of siege, guarded at every point by fifteen thousand troops in complete war equipment, by thousands of police agents, by bands of volunteers and by the members of the "Committee of Union and Progress"; the lamentations, the tears, the abandonments, the imprecations, the many suicides, the instantaneous deaths from sheer terror, the sudden unhinging of men's reason, the conflagrations, the shooting of victims in the city, the ruthless searches through the houses and in the countryside; the hundreds of corpses found every day along the exile road; the young women converted by force to

Islam or exiled like the rest; the children torn away from their families or from the Christian schools, and handed over by force to Moslem families, or else placed by hundreds on board ship in nothing but their shirts, and then capsized and drowned in the Black Sea and the river Deyirmen Deré — these are my last ineffaceable memories of Trebizond, memories which still, at a months' distance, torment my soul and almost drive me frantic.

Proclamation by the Turkish Government

Early in the spring of 1915 the following proclamation was sent to all the officials in the interior of Turkey: —

First. All Armenians, with the exception of the sick, shall leave their villages or quarters, under the escort of the gendarmerie, within five days from the date of this proclamation.

Second. Though they are free to carry with them on their journey such articles of movable property as they may desire, they are forbidden to sell their lands or their extra effects, or to leave the latter with other persons, as their exile is only temporary, and their landed property and the effects they are unable to take with them will be taken care of under supervision of the Government, and stored in protected buildings. Any one who sells or attempts to dispose of his movable effects or landed property in a manner contrary to this order, shall be tried by *court-martial.* Persons are free to sell to the Government only such articles as may answer the needs of the army. . . .

The fifth clause reads: —

Since the Armenians are obliged to submit to the decision of the Government, if any of them attempt to resist the soldiers or gendarmes by force of arms, arms shall be used against them, and they shall be taken dead or alive. In like manner, those who, in opposition to the Government's decision, refrain from leaving or seek to hide themselves, shall

be sent before a court martial; and if they are sheltered or given food and assistance, the persons who shelter or aid them shall be sent before the court martial for execution. [Extracts.]

Such was the order in accordance with which all these things were done.

CHAPTER XX

ALLEGED AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN ATROCITIES IN SERVIA

In 1910 I became acquainted with Professor R. A. Reiss, of the University of Lausanne. I formed a high opinion of him. He is regarded as a distinguished man of science and a skilled investigator. From personal investigations in Servia, he has compiled a report of the extraordinary cruelties of the invading armies. He visited Belgrade, Schabatz, and Loznitza while they were under fire.

I give here a few extracts from his report.

Houses were set on fire and people roasted to death. Fires were lit under the beds of the wounded. Women, children, and old men were put in front of the Austrian fighting line during battle, and mention is made of women being compelled to march with the soldiers within two days after their children had been born. Churches were utilized for the vilest and most degrading practices. Some families were pinioned together and buried in ditches with their dogs.

Massacres of civilians

There are many cases of the abduction of young girls and their detention for days at a time by the enemy. Officers as well as men were guilty of these outrages, but the officers did not go to the same extreme as they permitted the privates in the worst orgies of lust and drunkenness.

A private of the Seventy-ninth Regiment said that near Drenovatz the Austrian officers made a ring of twenty-six

persons round a house and then set fire to the house, thus burning the twenty-six victims.

At the same town the Austrians arrested five hundred to six hundred women and girls and kept them at the hotel for four days for the pleasure of the soldiers.

In the three districts of Polzerie, Matchva, and Yadar, the various kinds of death and torture inflicted were apportioned as follows: —

	Males	*Females*
Victims shot	345	64
Victims killed with knives	113	27
Victims hanged	7	6
Victims massacred and clubbed to death with sticks and butt-ends of rifles	48	2
Victims disemboweled	2	4
Victims burned alive	35	96
Victims pinioned and robbed	52	12
Victims whose arms were cut off, torn off or broken	5	1
Victims whose noses were cut off	28	6
Victims whose ears were cut off	31	7
Victims whose eyes were put out	30	38
Victims whose genital organs were mutilated	3	3
Victims whose skin was cut in strips, or portions of their face detached	15	3
Victims stoned	12	1
Victims whose breasts were cut off	0	2
Victims cut in pieces	17	16
Victims beheaded	1	0
Little girl thrown to the pigs	0	1
Victims killed without the manner of their deaths being specified	240	55

Summing up the evidence Professor Reiss says: —

The number of victims — children, women, young men, and old men — amounts to a comparatively high percentage of the population of the territory invaded. . . . Once the bloodthirsty and Sadic brute was unchained and let loose by his superiors, the work of destruction was duly carried out by men who are fathers of families and probably kindly in private life.

I add to this trustworthy account of the alleged atrocities of the Austro-Hungarian Army in Servia a description of the sinking of the Ancona, written by

Dr. Cecile Greil, an American woman, for the New York "Times." All the survivors testify that there was no warning from the submarine for the vessel to stop. The submarine began to shell the ship immediately. Dr. Greil says: —

A terrific vibration shook the ship. I was thrown back into my seat. I knew that the ship must be stopping. I heard a running and scurrying about the deck outside. Looking out, I saw, through the dining-saloon window, six or ten stewards in white whirling out of sight around an angle.

The submarine stood out in clear, black outline against the white background of mist.

I went toward the bow of the ship. I descended the staircase to the second cabin, on the way to the purser's office. A large part of the staircase had been shot away — and the horror of what I saw at the bottom of it made me instantly forget what I was going for. There lay three or four women, four or five children, and several men. Some of them were already dead, all, at least, badly wounded. I made sure two of the children were dead. The purser sprawled limply across his desk, inert, like a sack of meal that has been flung down and stays where it lies. He had been shot in the head. The blood was running bright like red paint, freshly spilt, down his back, and his hair was matted with it.

The first series of shots had wrecked this part of the ship, breaking through and carrying away whole sections of the framework. I tried to get back up the stairs. But in the slight interval of time I had consumed, enough additional shells had been discharged to finish the wreck of the staircase. Seeing my exit that way cut off, I started through the second cabin to go up the central stairway. The sight that I ran into there was indescribable. All the passengers from the third cabin had rushed up into the second. They had altogether lost their wits. The only thing that was left them was the animal instinct for self-preservation in its

most disastrous and most idiotic form. Men, women, and children were burrowing head-foremost under chairs and benches and tables.

All the while the detonations, like continuous thunder and lightning, increased the panic. Women were on their knees in mental agony, each supplicating the particular saint of the part of the country from which she came to save her from death.

A boat was being lowered. It had been swung out on the davits. It already seethed full of people. And more men and women and children were fighting, in a promiscuous, shrieking mass, to get into it as it swung out and down. The men, with their superior strength, were, of course, getting the best of the struggle. Age or sex had no weight. It was brute strength that prevailed.

Others flung their bodies pell-mell on the heads of those already overboard. Some, in their frenzy, missed the mark at which they aimed themselves and fell into the sea. To make the horror complete, the boat now stuck at one end, tilted downward, and spilled all its occupants into the sea, ninety or a hundred at once. They seized each other. Some swam. Others floundered and sank almost immediately, dragging each other down. Some drowned themselves even with lifebelts on, not knowing how to hold their heads out of the water.

I saw one man who had started to run up the gangway to the officer's deck come plunging down again. He had been struck in the back of the head.

In my cabin I flung up the top of my steamer trunk. As I was searching for my valuables my chambermaid appeared in the doorway; half a dozen times I had met her rushing frantically and aimlessly up and down.

"Oh, madame, madame — we shall all be killed, we're all going to get killed!"

"Maria," I advised as quietly and soothingly as I could, still stooping over my trunk; "don't be so mad, get a life-belt on, and get up out of here."

Before she could speak again she was a dead woman. A shot carried away the porthole and sheared off the top of

her head. It finished its course by exploding at the other side of the ship. If I had not been stooping over at the time I would not have lived to write this story.

When I got up on deck I saw the submarine carefully circumnavigating its victims and deliberately shooting toward us at all angles. I ran along the deck. The sea was full of deck rails, parts of doors, and other wreckage, and dotted with human beings, some dead, others alive, and screaming for help. There was another boat in front that tilted and dumped out its frantic load into the sea. Peering over the side of the ship, I saw a boat that had already been lowered to the water's edge. In it I recognized the two ship's doctors, and two of the seamen. There was also an officer in the boat, Carlo Lamberti, the chief engineer. He sat at the helm. I called out to them to take me in.

"Jump!" they shouted back.

I escaped with a ducking.

An immigrant girl who followed me flung herself down wildly and broke both her legs on the side of the ship.

Then the torpedo was discharged. It whizzed across the ship, drawing a tail behind it like a comet. It plunged beneath the Ancona as if guided by a diabolical intelligence of its own. There followed a terrific explosion. Huge jets of thick black smoke shot up, with showers of débris. Our boat rocked and swayed in the roughened water. The Ancona lurched to the left, righted herself, shivered a moment — then her bow shot high in the air like a struggling, death-stricken animal. She went under, drawing a huge, funnel-like vortex after her. There were many people wounded, so that they could not get off unaided. They were left to die.

Over two hundred men, women and children perished miserably.

Let us pause a moment to consider this scene, with the murder, by shell fire and drowning, of two hundred human beings. Such a deed is not unparalleled in atrociousness. The records of the destruction of the

Armenians describe events that are even more terrible. Still, I think that all will agree that the Turkish Government need not be ashamed of the Austro-Hungarian Government.

CHAPTER XXI

ENGLAND

I PROPOSE to give a picture of the general feeling in England: As to the Germans and Germany; as to the navy; as to tariffs; as to labor and capital; as to France; as to terms of peace.

To understand the attitude of England in regard to all these questions, it is essential first of all to understand her feeling toward the Germans and Germany. The impressions I received on this point are the result of contact with English people whom I visited, with the more important heads of industry and business men, with editors, and with people in general.

I was spending a week-end at the home of a family whose name is known all over the world, and my hostess was speaking about the feeling of England with regard to Germany. After an extraordinary series of statements she ended up with this, that she wanted Berlin razed to the ground and a wall built around it. Another lady, a member of the household, turned to me apologetically and rather remonstrated with the hostess for her extreme views, and then, trying to explain to me, she said: "You know, Mr. McClure, we look upon the Germans as something like gorillas."

I was then taken to a library where there were bookshelves lining one side of the room. My hostess pulled out what was apparently shelves of books, and it was really a door, and behind it was a large closet, almost a room, and she showed me there a loaded revolver. She said that if the Germans should come the women

would go into the closet, and if discovered they would shoot themselves. I was telling this to friends in London, and they said, "Certainly; our women are prepared to shoot themselves rather than fall into the hands of the Germans, if by any chance there should be an invasion of England."

At bottom the feeling in England is one rather of horror and disappointment than of hatred. When I was in Belgium I was told of the mass of material collected by Professor Jean Massart, dealing with the experiences of the Belgian people during the invasion and the first year of occupation. This book is now published; it is much more illuminating than the Bryce Report, and has greatly deepened the feeling in England in regard to the invasion of Belgium. This is only one of a mass of publications, in English and French, which, together with such acts as the execution of Captain Fryatt and the Lille deportations, have hardened the determination of England; and there is no doubt but that the effect of these things on the public mind is such as greatly to lengthen the war.

I was talking to a man of great shipping interests about Captain Fryatt, who had dodged the submarines and brought his ship back safely from many voyages. He was given a gold watch by his Company, the Great Eastern Railway Company; and this man said that later on Captain Fryatt was faced by a submarine which he tried to ram, and he received a watch from the Admiralty in recognition of his splendid seamanship. "He had not sunk a submarine," he said, "but had protected his property in the only way he could." This man said that the execution of Captain Fryatt had made a more profound impression in all shipping

and business circles than almost any other single event, and would greatly harden the terms of peace which England would impose. Then he went on to say that in the first few months of the war there was no special feeling against the Germans by the English, but that the sinking of the Lusitania and the Bryce Report and other similar things had brought about the present state of feeling; and he added: "You know, it is not so much hatred we feel to the Germans; we look upon them as we might look upon snakes." This man's name is known widely in America as well as in England. He expressed the average thought of industrial and shipping England.

The Reverend A. J. Campbell, one of the foremost preachers of England, said: —

> Germany is a unique moral phenomenon, a case of depravity on a grand scale, engendered by forty years' worship of the blood-god. We may as well appeal to the finer instincts of a Bengal tiger as try to make this people realize its offense against all that is high and noble in the relations of states and individuals.
>
> Germany is a criminal nation, and ought to be treated as criminals are treated in any civilized community on earth. The criminal fears for his skin and nothing else.

An American lady, a writer who has written for "McClure's Magazine," was reading me a poem by the great Belgian poet, a Belgian cradle song, and the last line was, "O Lord! Deliver us from the Germans"; she stopped and in the most intense fashion, her eyes shining with tears, she said: "That is the prayer of every woman and girl in England, Belgium, and France."

In addition to the published material on this topic,

there is a constant body of new information coming by word of mouth. I am told that Lord Bryce was very skeptical in regard to the Belgian atrocities when he began investigation. His feeling now is as strong as that of any one I have met. Besides, there are numerous documents of a more terrible sort, which have not been published, but are in the hands of the Government. Those have been seen by various people and have had a tremendous effect.

I had an interview with Lord Cromer — a man whose services to the Empire in India and Egypt have given him an imperial outlook and a thorough grasp of the world-problems involved in this war. He talked about the real issue of the war — the future of the East, especially the questions of the Balkans and Asia Minor. "But," he said, "it is not these matters that aroused England. Lord Beaconsfield said that the English are a sentimental people. It is such things as the treatment of Belgium, the Lusitania, the Zeppelin raids, Edith Cavell, and now Captain Fryatt and the deportations from Lille, that have reached the ultimate elements of our people, and have aroused and unified England and the Empire."

Another man of the widest information said to me; "Put the Zeppelin first. The Zeppelins spoke to the masses in the North, who disbelieved London and the Government."

"We shall not forget," another official said to me, and his manner meant more than his words. The anniversary of the war, August 4, 1916, reminded people that they might have failed in 1914 and remained out of the war. This they feel would have meant spiritual death and moral degradation.

At the present time all ordinary notions of a navy have passed away. Great Britain possesses vastly more sea power than she had at the beginning of the war. Two thirds of the engineering ability of the Empire is devoted to building new navies. The people recognize the numerous and tremendous duties of the navy, which they regard as vital to the existence of England and of the Empire.

Recently Mr. Balfour visited the naval works on the Clyde. He spoke little of the tremendous power of the navy at the present time, but the keynote of his speech was this: "It is magnificent, and I am here to tell you that splendid and magnificent though it be, we of the Admiralty call for yet more." He then reviewed the work of the navy and of the mercantile marine, forty-two per cent of which is occupied directly in war work, carrying on their great military operations. Ten per cent of the mercantile marine is at the service of the Allies. So far as naval power is concerned, one may state that at the end of this war, whenever it may come, Great Britain will possess a great navy, the power and extent of which are almost unimaginable.

A high Admiralty official said to me: —

England is a fortress with her communications on the sea. Cut her communications and she starves. England is the citadel of the Empire. Starve the citadel and the outlying nations and dominions cannot remain free. England has a great army, splendidly trained and equipped, but she has what is more vital, a super-navy. The navy has doubled in personnel in two years, and in one river we are now building a complete navy, battleships, battle cruisers, cruisers, torpedo boats, and submarines, equal to a third-class navy. And in other places we are building an enormous number of warships of all classes. A million men, with the finest en-

gineering talent and best machinery, work solely for the navy.

We have only begun warfare against the submarine, and already one hundred thousand picked men, with three thousand submarine destroyers and submarine traps that could make a complete barrier from Dover to New York, make the life of an enemy submarine that of a hunted creature, from the time it enters the North Sea. Millions of men have crossed to France, back and forth, and not one lost, millions of tons of supplies, munitions, coal, and steel are shipped every month to France with absolute safety. Our transport system is equal to the navy in organization.

The existence of England, the well-being of the Empire, depend on our control of the sea. We will end the war with an unconquerable navy.

The navy is to us what the air-tube is to the diver.

The question of the submarine has caused great naval activities. In the month of July, 1914, when there was not the slightest appearance of a European war, Sir Percy Scott, one of the greatest naval authorities in England, wrote a letter to the "Times" upholding the belief that there was no use in building battleships, that the submarine put an end to the usefulness of warships of all kinds; and many people believed as he did. To master the submarine, therefore, was a thing of vital necessity to England, and the ablest minds of the Empire, coöperating with Admiral Jellicoe, set out to solve this question.

A merchant, a strong free-trader whom I interviewed, pooh-poohed the idea that enmity would prevent trading after the war; but he said: "I cannot imagine any German being allowed to come to England to sell goods, nor can I imagine any Englishman acting as an agent for German goods. Germany will be the social pariah for thirty years."

The feeling in regard to Germany has much to do with opinions as to tariffs after the war and with the attitude of labor and capital. There is a strong body of opinion somewhat like this: England has been a country built up on the policy of free trade. In this great war she has been able not only to maintain colossal armies and colossal fleets, naval and mercantile, but to furnish material and money to her allies on a scale hitherto undreamed of. England has borrowed a few hundred million dollars in America, but meantime she has loaned four thousand million dollars to her allies. This, they say, is one of the results of her free-trade policy; they say there is no bottom to her resources, and further, that if after the war England puts on protective tariffs, she really will have lost the war. The arguments given by those in favor of the imposition of tariffs receive a considerable backing on account of hostility to Germany.

In regard to relations of labor and capital, two ideas dominate. One is that labor must be sure of a proper share of the profits from industry, and also of proper conditions for work; and secondly, that labor and capital must coöperate so as to produce as much as possible. These ideas dominate all discussions in regard to labor and capital.

Whatever the outcome of the war, an entirely new body of beliefs and ideals in social, political, and industrial activities will dominate England.

First of all, woman suffrage is absolutely sure. No one speaks differently; they all say that women have shown their right to vote. I remarked to one of the best-informed editors in London that we should soon have universal woman suffrage in the United States;

his reply was that they would have it in England before we had it. Suffrage is obtained by men in England on very moderate terms. Even these restrictions now will be abolished. The universal saying is that if a man is fit to fight he is fit to vote, and one member of Parliament interjected into a serious debate this remark: "One gun, one vote."

Universal suffrage, therefore, for both men and women is immediately imminent in England. In a recent speech Mr. Asquith said: —

> I say to the House quite candidly, as a lifelong opponent of woman suffrage, I cannot deny that claim.

This comes, however, as a part of a larger condition in the general uplift of all workers.

With this also comes the expansion of new and more profitable and more important fields of labor for women. Several times I have seen women driving huge delivery wagons or trucks on the streets. A large share of the conductors of busses are women. Perhaps the most striking illustration of the new work for women is the employment of women waitresses in the London clubs; and club members in general say that they do not want to change after the war, and some one said it did not seem to be a real man's work to be a waiter in a club. That in part arises from the new attitude toward work as work. Work is now highly honorable, leisure is not.

Probably five million women were gainfully employed before the war, and at the present time from half to three quarters of a million additional are employed; so that it is not so much the increase in numbers of women workers that has revolutionized thought

about woman's work, as the advance in their work. Women workers, like every other class of workers in England, have been advanced in the kind of work performed by them. When a million men have been withdrawn from industry, a million men and women have been called up from somewhere lower down to take their place.

The most striking employment of women has been in munition factories, where they have done marvelous work; they have been indispensable. In one munition center, manufacturing near London, there are ten thousand five hundred women and they are trying to raise the number to thirty thousand in that one factory.

After working two months in munition factories, a woman gets a triangular badge marked "On War Service." One finds the same spirit among these women as one finds among the five million volunteers. They are drawn from every class of society, from the highest to the lowest. It is like a volunteer war mobilization; and these women who have once tasted the joy of achievement and the independence of a good income are not going back to idleness any more than the submerged men who have been advanced from lower to higher levels of employment. The most astonishing thing is the aspect of these women workers. They give the impression of being well, strong, happy, glad to be at work and proud of their achievement.

Lloyd George says: —

And these women, these young girls, submit cheerfully to long hours, to hard work, to monotonous work, so that they may "beat the Germans." Many of the firms that engage them have never employed women before; many that em-

ployed tens, now employ hundreds of thousands. The change has been sudden.

Lord Haldane told me an illustrative anecdote of a house-party in Scotland. A young lady excused herself at half-past nine o'clock. Lord Haldane asked her why she was going so early. She said she was on the night shift. This girl, the daughter of a wealthy and noble family, was working nights in a munition factory.

The question of trade-unionism for women is imminent. Aside from household servants there are two and a half million women workers in England, and including household servants there are five and a half million; but to-day there are only two hundred and fifty thousand women in trade-unions.

The change in labor circles is extraordinary. "This war has saved trade-unionism," a member of the Ministry said yesterday. A new motto is being discussed, — "The greatest possible output for the highest possible wages."

Mr. John Hodge, M.P., who until recently was acting chairman of the Parliamentary Labor Party, and is one of the most enlightened and courageous labor leaders in the country, said in an interview: —

> There is no doubt that the policy of restriction of output which many trade-unionists have had to adopt in their own defense is economically quite unsound, and we must make efforts to see if it cannot be rendered unnecessary after the war.

The most authoritative expression of labor in England was made at the Trade-Union Congress held in Birmingham early in September, 1916. The resolution was offered advising the meeting of representatives of labor from all countries to hold sessions at the same

time as the meetings of the belligerent powers to determine the terms of peace. By a vote of two to one this Trade-Union Congress of Great Britain and Ireland refused to consider having representatives of German labor present.

Both in England and in France Socialists are discussing whether or not, after the war, they will resume relations with the German Socialists. I heard the man who is regarded as the father of English Socialism, the head of the socialistic movement, make this remark: "In time perhaps we will admit the German Socialists into the international organization, but not on the same terms as formerly. We won't let them try to dominate as they used to; they will have a much humbler position." This state of mind influences the probable length of the war and the terms of peace.

There are now no unemployed in England. One of the amazing phenomena of the war is the demonstration of the amount of unused labor resources before the war. Nearly eight millions of people are directly occupied on the war, withdrawn from all the other fields of industry. This constitutes what might be called the slack, the hitherto unused labor, not only in the number of workers, but in the amount of work each one does. The people are calm, confident. They have willingly mastered the various problems, they have determined lines of policy, they have met the various possibilities and solved them.

The determination to carry the war to a safe peace reaches to the uttermost element of the people. The awakening has changed the characteristics of all classes. There is an alertness, a respect for labor, a rejuvenation. To mingle with these people is like

being in a young, booming Western town. It is a new England, new to its very roots. There are conventions and meetings and discussions in the newspapers about education, agriculture, welfare work in factories and readjustment of the rights of labor to have a greater share of profits. Great industries like the manufacturing of dyes are being developed in such fashion as to make England self-contained.

I have talked with leading American and English manufacturers, labor leaders, merchants, and professional men. All impress me with a sense of sureness and competency for mastery in war and industry. "This is an incredible people," an American said to me. "Incredible in their deliberation, and in their determination, and above all, incredible in their achievement."

England has loaned the Allies four billion dollars; raised, trained, and equipped an army of five million men; created new factories; carried on military, naval, and mercantile enterprises all over the world; and performed the activities of peace, with half her usual labor. Said an American manufacturer, who has great works in England: "The war is standardized so that everything is done well, and the nation does its work easily."

Everywhere I traveled in England I saw new factories being built. In a journey of three hours I saw six different factories of great extent in course of erection in the vicinity of towns and villages where there were no other factories. In the great manufacturing centers new extensions are being built. All these new factories are for the purpose of increasing the munition output.

Although the manufacturing ability of England has been greatly increased, both by greater activity on the

part of workingmen and by increased facilities, eighty per cent of all the manufacturing facilities in Great Britain is devoted to munitions and armaments.

Over a million men are working on land for the navy. The manufacture of aeroplanes is going on on a huge scale, it being the fixed intention of England to extend her navy to the air, and secure the same dominance in the air as she has on the sea.

England is an island only so long as she can protect herself against air raids, sea raids, or under-sea raids. Therefore, she is expending enormous sums to counteract the submarine and to assure the complete mastery of the air. In one establishment a small department had been devoted to aeroplanes, and they have increased their facilities so as to produce fourteen machines a week. I am told that the total number of aeroplanes turned out daily in the British Isles is considerably over fifty, and will soon approach one hundred.

One of the establishments I visited employed ten thousand people. Seven thousand of these employees were women. It was a small portion of the plant of a great munition concern.

In one factory it was almost impossible to see the boundary wall in either direction, and this factory, as big as several city blocks, is occupied almost solely by women, working at their lathes, producing fuses. There were acres and acres of women here forming an insignificant portion of the hundreds of thousands of women who are now working in munition factories.

I have seen shells made by the thousands and hundreds of thousands. I have seen orders calling for millions of shells. In the manufacturing of the fuse, I

was told that over one hundred different gauges were required. There is no more delicate piece of mechanism than the shell fuse. It is as delicate as a watch. I saw these fuses being made by the hundreds of thousands, mostly by women. I saw shells, from the small shell, one-and-a-quarter pounds in weight when loaded, to shells fifteen inches in diameter.

There is one Government munitions works, where they deal with explosives, that is twenty miles in length, and averages four miles in width. Contracts for munitions are being made by the Government that will require five years to fulfill.

England is devoted to one single object; that is, to waging this war. There is a continual search for new men of military competence. There is talk of the possibility of raising the age limit to forty-five. A writer in the "Times," speaking of Germany, said that, if necessary, Germany would extend the age limit from sixteen to sixty. I believe that in another year generally in the warring countries the limits will be from seventeen to fifty. This war differs from all other wars in that it can be won only by the killing of the enemy.

If the Franco-Prussian War had lasted forty years, the German losses would have been little more than they have been from these two years of war. What is true of Germany is true of the other powers. There is no limit to the use of shells or to the amount of artillery.

I have seen many trainloads of English soldiers going to the front and many trainloads of the wounded returning from the front. I have seen the same thing in Germany and Austria, and always I have been amazed at the youthfulness of the soldiers. The whole youth of Europe from the age of eighteen is involved in this

overwhelming catastrophe, which is utterly unlike any previous world-war.

I never felt so fully the incredible horror of this war, where the young women and men beyond military age, aided by experts, combine in every country to produce the most terrible weapons of destruction to kill the youth of the other countries.

In other matters also England is at the dawn. It is a new British Empire, and there are great problems involved in what is called the organization of the Empire.

One might add that England is at the dawn with regard to the solution of the Irish question, except that every one recognizes that a great step has been made by the coming together of Carson and Redmond, as in the case of the recently attempted settlement.

English people look forward to the solution of these questions in varying moods of hopefulness and doubt. One thing, however, can be said, not only of England but of all the countries of the world, that, in actual achievement, the human race does things better than one would imagine from debates in Parliaments or writings and speeches by reformers.

England is at the dawn because all the people have entered upon freedom. The barriers of caste and social strata have been broken down. This has come about in part because the salvation of the nation depended upon extraordinary efforts on the part of the workers to produce munitions of war.

Lloyd George says: —

Among all the changes which the Great War has brought in its train, none is more significant, and none more likely to

have lasting effect, than the revolution in the structure of British industry. For the first time in our history many firms have submitted to a general control by the State; many workers have desisted from the endeavor to regulate the supply and restrict the output of labor. The factories are alive with new workers; the State assumes new responsibilities; fresh needs and opportunities arise; industrial conditions are in solution.

As to the feeling in England toward France, one could say in one word that there is between these two countries a union of feeling and of interests that would seem to be almost as close as between England and Canada, or England and Australia. There is in England unqualified admiration for France, just as universal and profound as the unqualified hatred for Germany. When any one speaks of France it is with a change of voice and an expression of extraordinary admiration and affection.

England and France are absolutely united in the determination to fight until the military situation shall give them the peace terms they demand. The war is a thing that they propose to put through. There is no thought or discussion of anything but going on to a satisfactory and successful issue. The unanimity is profound and intense. It never happened before in the history of England, such a unanimity. The same is true of France, the same is true of Germany.

Mr. Asquith said August 5, 1916: —

We face the third year of the war with an ever-growing confidence in the final success of the Allied cause, and with a resolution, confirmed by each illustration of German lawlessness and savagery, to fight on till the future of civilization is established on the firm foundation of humanity, justice, and freedom.

The terms of peace are being worked out under the influence of the states of mind I have described. Any one who knows Germany will know that in order for France to get back Alsace and Lorraine, the situation will have to be very different from what it is at the present time, and yet France intends to go on and on until that particular measure can be imposed. There is also another point. The Allies propose to have the greatest assizes in human history. There is to be a Day of Judgment at the Peace Conference, dealing with the great mass of evidence on alleged atrocities collected by the French and the English Governments, including such outstanding matters as the assassination of Captain Fryatt, the sinking of the Lusitania, and the execution of Edith Cavell.

Speaking on April 27, 1916, Mr. Asquith said: —

I say with all emphasis and with all deliberation, when we come to an end of this war, — which please God we may, — we shall not forget, and we ought not to forget, this horrible record of calculated cruelty and crime; and we shall hold it to be our duty to exact such reparation against those who are proved to have been the guilty agents and actors in the matter as it may be possible for us to do.

And again on August 4, 1916: —

There is one feature in the later developments of the enemies' methods which seems on the face to my mind to indicate a sense of desperation. I mean the recrudescence of deliberate and calculated barbarity. The Belgian civil population who refuse to work to maintain and improve the military position of their invaders and oppressors are literally being treated like slaves. The horrors of the recent deportation of large numbers of civilians in Lille and the other towns of Northern France, the midnight raids upon private dwellings, the wholesale abduction of women and girls — that is

a story which, when it comes to be fully written, will be found to blacken even the besmirched annals of the German army.

The first week in September might be called "Zeppelin week" in England, where people occupying an area of over a thousand square miles were able to see the destruction of the Zeppelin that fell near Cuffley. Probably over a million people saw this sight, as the guns had wakened almost every one, and over the entire area people cheered. On the Thames ships blew their whistles. Some one said it was like a New Year's night. This Zeppelin fell in a field on the very edge of a village, from which one got a marvelous view of the most beautiful rural scenery, the Zeppelin having fallen on the hillside.

I was present at the funeral of the Zeppelin crew given by English airmen. Crowds of people, extending for miles along the road into the village, had turned out to see this funeral, and just as the great lorries, bearing the coffins, covered with a black cloth, reached the cemetery, a woman threw an egg. This was deeply resented by all the people and the woman was arrested and taken to the police station.

A single grave had been dug for the commander of the Zeppelin at the end of a long grave dug for the other fifteen airmen, and the funeral service was first read over the commander, who was referred to as "this unknown German officer," and then the service was read over the other fifteen, who were referred to as "these unknown German airmen." There were about two hundred of the Royal Flying Corps who had charge of the funeral, and as these young men stood to attention during the funeral, I realized for the first time the

character and the quality of the airmen. They were youths from nineteen to twenty-three or twenty-four. They were drawn largely from the great public schools of England. They gave an impression not only of extraordinary physical fitness, but of detachment from ordinary human affairs. They seemed of a superior breed who had come from some greater race; they stood there detached and remote.

The airmen of the belligerents have retained the older professional ideas of chivalry. On the way back to London the compartment I was in was filled with the wives of workingmen whom interest or curiosity had brought to the funeral. They spoke of experiences of their neighbors or friends with the Zeppelins. They were indignant at the woman who had thrown an egg. They said the members of the Zeppelin crew had only obeyed the orders of their Government. Then they talked of their poor mothers and wives in Germany. They discussed the ethics of Zeppelin raids. Some thought they were legal and proper, while others thought they were illegal. One woman, evidently of a higher class, stated that it was quite right so long as only property was destroyed, but if civilians were killed, it was illegal. She herself had suffered the loss of a house, but she felt that the Germans were within their rights in destroying it.

CHAPTER XXII

GERMANY

Impressions of a Visit in the Early Months of 1916

One is surprised at the unanimity of the German people in regard to certain fundamental questions, until one reflects that such unanimity is a very general phenomenon.

In 1860 and 1861 millions of men believed so strongly in States' rights as to enter upon and carry on a four years' war, and millions of them believed so strongly in the union of the States and the suppression of slavery as to do the same thing. Members of political parties for long periods hold identical beliefs.

So there is no mystery or marvel in the state of mind of the people in Germany, or England, or France. Some months ago a writer in the London "Times" spoke of the German people as being in a manner hypnotized, and accounted for their unanimity by the influence of the press. It is unnecessary to regard the people as hypnotized. One sees similar phenomena in all human society.

So, when I give the views held by the German people, I do not describe a unique condition. I spent most of the time between January 6 and April 26, 1916, in Germany, and I met and talked with hundreds of people, — officers, university professors, their wives and daughters and sons, business men, journalists, government officials, including the most powerful

members of the Reichstag,—people in all walks of life. I found the beliefs and feelings of all either identical or very similar. I shall tell here what the German people hold as their most fixed and profound convictions and beliefs. First, there is the most complete assurance of victory in this war, and among the best informed is the absolute belief that the war is already won. Secondly, there is the absolute belief that Germany is in no way the aggressor, but the victim of aggression in this war; that Germany wanted no war, but that war was wantonly and wickedly forced upon Germany.

This being their settled conviction, they all feel that the request of the German Government for a peaceful passage through Belgium was reasonable and right, and that Belgium's refusal, combined with the negotiations, during previous years, between certain officials in Belgium and certain British military officials, justifies their course in regard to Belgium. I have met no one who does not feel that Belgium, or rather the Government of Belgium, is responsible for her woes, and that in this war Germany and not Belgium has cause for complaint. They feel absolutely justified in treating Belgium as an enemy, conquered country, and justify their tax of $96,000,000 a year to support the army of occupation as legal and just according to the laws of The Hague.

Every one I have talked to is surprised and hurt at the attitude of the majority of the American people, and believes that the Americans have been misinformed and misled by British intrigue. Above all they are surprised by Mr. Roosevelt's position in this war. "He," they say, "has been in Germany; he has

met our Kaiser; he knows our institutions; why did he make up his mind without learning the German side?"

Herr Zimmermann, then Permanent Under-Secretary of State (now Foreign Minister), asked this question at my very first interview with him. I answered that Mr. Roosevelt and the mass of American people did not make up their minds on account of arguments advanced by the enemies of Germany. I said it was "Belgium, Lusitania, Scrap of Paper."

"We offered to pay Belgium for all the damage our passing through would cause," he said. "We made the offer twice. If the old king had been living," he continued, with a smile, "he would have accepted our offer — but he would have charged double.

"We were attacked suddenly on all sides, our very life was at stake, we only asked permission to defend ourselves.

"As to the 'Scrap of Paper,' what our Government meant was that, on account of Belgium's situation and her negotiations with other powers, the treaty of neutrality had become a scrap of paper.

"And the Lusitania? Why, we warned the Americans not to sail on her. What more could we have done? She was loaded with ammunition to kill our soldiers. We are sorry for the poor people who were drowned, but it was our duty to protect our soldiers."

I replied that it was not the violation of international law that caused the attitude of the American people in the Lusitania case, but the natural, instinctive horror that is deeper and more unchangeable than law.

Herr Zimmermann is worthy of a special study himself. He is a man of energy and mental alertness, a tremendous worker. He gives the impression of masterfulness, of absolute intellectual integrity. He possesses charm in a marked degree. Of his basic sincerity, intellectual and moral, there can be no doubt. He wins in a high degree, affection, confidence, and respect. Dr. Zimmermann has spent his life in government service. He is a self-made man in the best sense. In the Far East he won distinction as a consul. His services secured him a place in the Foreign Office and he ultimately became permanent Under-Secretary of State. Recently he was appointed Foreign Minister. Herr Zimmermann used every day to meet the newspaper correspondents. His personality secured for him great friendliness on the part of the newspaper men and others with whom he dealt. He has had no experience in the great world outside of government service.

Von Bethmann-Hollweg, the Chancellor of the German Empire, is a man of wide and profound intellectual interests, a lover of literature, in international politics a pacifist. His basic principle in international affairs was to compose the differences with England. I know of no public man in any country whose words command more complete belief than his. He has the supreme confidence of the German people for absolute honesty and rectitude. Von Bethmann-Hollweg's entire life has been spent in government. He began as so many officials begin, in a humble capacity in city government. He advanced until he became Prussian Minister of the Interior. This office has for one of its most important fields a general oversight of city gov-

ernments. He was a fellow student with the present Emperor of Germany at Bonn. He has had no experience in the world of industry or finance.

I spent a memorable day in Jena, visiting Professor Rudolph Eucken, meeting his wife and daughter also. I was the guest of Professor Wendt, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena, author of many books, including a great work on the teachings of Jesus, published also in England. Frau Wendt is a sister of Professor von Schultze-Gävernitz. She is a woman of singular sweetness and goodness. It would be hard to find gentler or more lovable people than those I visited at Jena. Professor Eucken's books have been published in many countries, including Japan. He has retired from active work, but many decades of students have been under his influence, and he is loved and honored by thousands in many countries.

It is difficult to describe this man, as he talked with a great burden of sorrow and feeling of intolerable misunderstanding. He spoke with especial sorrow of Mr. Roosevelt's views, and as he talked, his hands opened and closed nervously, his face, vivid and gentle, flushed. He said he had talked hours with Mr. Roosevelt, going back in history, and had enjoyed him immensely.

"Why did n't Mr. Roosevelt learn the truth about our side?" he asked. "We had many problems to solve, social and religious. All we wanted was peace to work out our problems. Our Emperor did not want to hurt Belgium. We were attacked on all sides and we had to protect our country. Why did Americans want to travel on a ship that was bringing ammuni-

tion to kill our soldiers? Our Emperor always worked for peace."

The next day Professor Eucken took me around the town and through the university, showing me the house where the young Schiller prepared the thesis that secured him his professorship; the various houses where Goethe lived when he made brief residences in Jena; the cathedral which began as a Catholic structure and ended as a Protestant church, in which Luther preached; also a hotel that bore the inscriptions: "Luther 1532, Bismarck 1892."

There is a street called Humboldtstrasse, where Humboldt lived. Haeckel lives in Jena — an old man — retired. Hegel and Fichte taught in the university. A professor of mathematics, Professor Abbe, was the founder and owner of the great Zeiss Works, where the best lenses are made. These works employ five thousand men, and, with the university, make the life of this town of nearly fifty thousand inhabitants.

When Professor Abbe died, after doing much for this town and university, he gave his great business to the university, so that the University of Jena is large and prosperous. Ordinarily there are two thousand students attending the university, young women as well as young men. Now there are only twelve hundred, many being in the war. There are sixty thousand German students in the war. Professor Eucken showed me the lists on one of the walls of the students killed since August, 1914. There were over two hundred, and every week added to the list. This university town, with its interest so remote from the world of affairs, had the same spirit and mind that I found in Hamburg, Berlin, Mannheim, and Frankfort.

Among the many people I met was Herr Deutsch, chairman of the A.E.G. (the General Electric Company of Germany), a great industrial concern with branches in many countries. Herr Deutsch is one of the most remarkable men in Europe.

"This is a war," he said, "between the principle of competition as practiced in business and commerce in England, and coöperation as practiced in Germany. We must win, for we are so organized as to use all our forces and resources. I cannot understand America. This is a war between the United States and Germany. It is the ammunition and supplies you send that enable our enemies to fight," he said.

Almost every one I met who had suffered by having relatives either killed or wounded believed that it was American shells that did the work.

To-day, the military and political chiefs of Germany believe that this war must be decided on the sea, not by destroying Great Britain's navy, but by crippling her commercial fleet to such an extent that she cannot get food.

"Great Britain imports five sixths of her food. Her supplies are lower than ever before in her history. Our desultory submarine warfare has already destroyed six per cent of her mercantile tonnage. If we could use our submarines freely, in six or seven weeks our new submarines would starve England into submission."

These were the words of one who is regarded as the foremost authority on the economics of submarine warfare.

This is Germany's hope. The position of the American Government is the only obstacle or hindrance to her free use of submarines. "Germany must

win. She must reach England. She has the new and potent weapon. Lives will be lost, but in the long run fewer than by a prolonged war."

The German people believe that if war must be, then let it be so terrible as to end soon.

Such is the reasoning of the leaders of Germany and such is the belief of the German people.

In talking with an expert on submarine economics, I said I wanted to write an article on "Why Germany expects to win the war."

"Germany does n't expect to win the war," he replied. "The war is won, and the English Government knows that we have won it."

I will close this study of Germany with an episode that was characteristic of a wish I found everywhere.

I was in Grodno, Russia, at the headquarters of the Twelfth German Army, February 16, 1916, with other newspaper correspondents. I was the oldest man among the correspondents. I had that day had my first flight in an aeroplane, and further was on the eve of my birthday, and so at a banquet with perhaps a hundred officers, the General in Command took occasion to address some pleasant words to me. In responding I closed with a toast to Germany (applause); to America (applause); to England. There came a moment of silence. (I had mentioned this toast with a certain dread.) I concluded with the hope that these great nations and their allies will combine together to advance human civilization. The expression of this hope was received with tremendous applause.

Throughout Germany and Austria-Hungary I found everywhere the desire to end the war and to establish good relations with England.

CHAPTER XXIII

TURKEY

I ARRIVED in Hamburg January 6, 1916. Hamburg was the only dead city I saw in Germany. The Atlantic Hotel, the Waldorf-Astoria of Hamburg, was almost deserted. But there was a great deal of literature scattered about in this hotel — books, pamphlets, and periodicals dealing with Constantinople and Turkey. Germany had secured control of the through route to Turkey and the splendid dream of the Orient filled all minds.

At 8 o'clock the morning of the 8th of January, I started for Berlin. It was raining. As I looked out of the window I saw two rows of children, one girls, the other boys, entering a large building, and it suddenly flashed on my mind that the children of Europe were going to school as before the war. Much of the life and activities of civilization were unchanged; and especially all that concerned the childhood of the race. Already I saw men ploughing. Mother Earth, too, was unchanged.

Through the great courtesy of the German Government, which secured for me also permission from the Governments of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, I was able to travel from Berlin to Constantinople. The military authorities gave permission to my friend Professor von Schultze-Gävernitz, to accompany me in his military capacity as a lieutenant.

So on March 1, 1916, we embarked on the Balkan-

zug for Constantinople. The departure of this semi-weekly train from either Berlin or Constantinople is an event comparable to the sailing of an ocean steamer. There are always people of importance and fame on the train, distinguished soldiers and officials, and their friends come to see them off. Our first important stop was at Breslau, where three noted women, cousins of Von Schultze-Gävernitz, came to see us. These women were at the head of the organizations to care for the health and well-being of the children of Breslau, and help solve the problems caused by war in the industrial life of the city. They wore little flags of Turkey. "Our allies," they said. The husband of one of these women was a Frenchman — an officer of the French army. The husband of another was a surgeon with the German forces at Verdun. "He writes me that it is just a hell," she said.

In the afternoon, soon after entering Austria, we stopped some minutes at Oderberg. On an adjoining track was a long freight train, the cars filled with men, women, and children. "Refugees from the battle front in Galicia," we were told, "on their way to Bohemia." The open door of each freight car was crowded with as many of the inmates as could look out. The men looked a little anxious, the women looked serious and patient. The children and babies were quiet and unsmiling, the babies like wilted flowers. They neither complained nor asked for anything. I gave a little girl of about five a piece of money. She quickly grasped my hand and kissed it, but there was no smile and no word, and none of the others asked for anything. They had lost their homes and their living. For days and nights they had been traveling in the winter weather, in cold

freight cars under harsh conditions, but their situation was fortunate compared to that of the several millions of men, women, and children who had been driven from their homes in Courland, Poland, Servia, and Asia Minor, hundreds of thousands of them to perish miserably, without shelter or food or human pity.

There came to my mind, as I saw these little ones, Mrs. Browning's poem, "The Cry of the Children," — the cry of the children in Armenia, Servia, Poland, and Belgium. —

> They look up with their pale and sunken faces,
> And their looks are sad to see,
> For the man's hoary anguish draws and presses
> Down the cheeks of infancy; . . .
>
> They look up with their pale and sunken faces,
> And their look is dread to see,
> For they mind you of their angels in high places,
> With eyes turned on Deity.
> "How long," they say, "how long, O cruel nation,
> Will you stand, to move the world, on a child's heart, —
> Stifle down with a mailed heel its palpitation,
> And tread onward to your throne amid the mart?
> Our blood splashes upward, O gold-heaper,
> And your purple shows your path!
> But the child's sob in the silence curses deeper
> Than the strong man in his wrath!"

When I awoke the next morning, Thursday, March 2, it was to a bright day with gleaming water by our side, — the Danube, — and just across the river on its little plateau the city of Belgrade, beautiful in situation and famous in history for wars and sieges. When we crossed the river, on the temporary bridge, we saw the usual effects of shells and fires in destroyed buildings, on the bottom lands, the city on the heights

revealing fewer tragedies from our viewpoint. All day we traveled through Servia. Spring cultivation there was far behind that in Belgium and Germany. All the bridges were destroyed, in many cases even the great steel structures which had carried the track of the Orient Express of former days. All the way from Berlin to Constantinople we saw soldiers guarding the railway, but in Servia every bridge and tunnel, and many other places, were guarded by little trench forts.

I was interested to meet on the train an educated young Turk who had been Turkey's representative at the International Agricultural Institute established by David Lubin in Rome, under the patronage of the King of Italy. He was returning to help in the modernizing of Turkey.

But the most important to me of the travelers I met on this journey was Dr. Jaeckh, an expert on the whole industrial and economic life and possibilities of Turkey.

From him I first got knowledge of the treaty which had been about to be consummated between England and Germany when war came. This was the document that I needed to explain many things that were vague or only partly understood by me. I knew that England and Germany had made great progress in removing the causes of irritation that for more than a decade had threatened the peace of Europe. I knew that both England and Germany had wanted peace in July, 1914; but among the obscurities that bothered me were — first, why was Austria so sharp and uncompromising in her demands on Servia; and second, just what had been the situation of Anglo-German relations. Both in Parliament and in the Reichstag it was stated authoritatively that England and Germany had worked

together to preserve the peace of Europe during the two Balkan wars; but I could get no definite framework of the actual facts that lay at the basis of this coöperation.

Dr. Jaeckh, however, had helped prepare the treaty of June, 1914, which is described in Chapter III, which had been agreed to through the negotiations between the two countries, and which had been initialed and ready for formal signature. And he told me the terms of this treaty.

Friday evening we reached Constantinople. A great crowd of people welcomed the train, the arrival of which twice weekly is an event even in this great city.

I found a Constantinople new in many ways. No dogs, paved streets, electric street-cars, a fine new bridge over the Golden Horn, electric lights, telephones, and a vivacity and activity on the streets excelling those of any city I had seen in all my recent travels in Europe. Here was the genuine mingling of the races of men. Every costume of the desert, and of the dwellers in the Orient was here, and many, many soldiers, sailors and officers, Turks, Germans, and Austrians. A city of a million and a half, in the most beautiful situation of any city in the world, picturesque, with the splendor and color of the East and an infusion of the energy and a sprinkling of the architecture of the West, half-conscious of the dawn of a new era, — such is Constantinople to the eye.

Constantinople is a triple city, the European city being divided by the Golden Horn into Stamboul and Galatea, and the third part, Scutari, lying in Asia across the Bosphorus.

When I was in Constantinople in March, 1916,

Talaat Bey held three or four portfolios in the Government including the portfolio of war. He is now Grand Vizier. Neither his predecessor in the viziership nor the Sultan were of any importance in the Turkish Government at that time, and then as now Talaat Bey was the absolute dictator of Turkey. I had two interviews with him.

Talaat Bey looks strong and powerful. He is like a great American political boss, only if he were an American boss he would be the king of bosses. He sits strong, faces you directly, speaks with simplicity and decision. His bearing is genial and large. At the beginning of our first interview some one handed him a letter. With one hand he tore off the end of the envelope, took out the enclosure, and threw the empty envelope on the floor, glanced a moment at the letter, and gave instructions to the bearer. All these things were done with extraordinary speed, and yet without the impression of hurry. He is a born master-executive.

No other ruler of to-day possesses his absolute authority. The life, liberty, and property of every inhabitant of Turkey are in his hands. I asked him why the Armenians were removed with such cruelties. He replied that some of the officials were not angels, and that 15,000 or 20,000 Armenians had been killed; but that he had sent out commissions to investigate those cruelties and that he would punish the guilty officials. The fate of the Armenians has been in his hands for more than two years. After seeing the leading men of the Central Powers, I should say that Talaat Bey is the strongest man between Berlin and hell.

Among the notables I met in Constantinople was the Grand Vizier. I said to him that Turkey was at

the dawn, that her resources were far less developed than those of even the United States, and that Turkey and England were among the oldest countries in Europe.

"Yes," he said. "But you cannot compare England to Turkey. England has had no such glorious history as Turkey. What was England three centuries ago?"

"This is a wonderful city," I said.

"The finest in the world," he replied. "That is why they all want it. That is why we have to fight to keep it."

"There was some talk," I said, "of removing the capital into Asia Minor."

"Pouf! Why should we? This is the best place. We are here between Europe and Asia. Over there is Asia." And he gave a gesture with his left hand as one might say, "Over there is my automobile."

In the guard-room, at the entrance to the palace of the Grand Vizier, I noticed a splendid-looking officer in charge of the guard — a regular young D'Artagnan. I learned that he was a Kurd. He told us of three wars he had been in, including recent fighting at the Suez Canal; and he bore marks of fighting and wore orders earned by bravery.

I said to him, "I've heard terrible things about your people."

He became very serious and answered me by saying that his people had no chance; that the Kurds were far from the culture of Europe, surrounded by barbarians,— such as Russians and Anatolians, — but that now they would have better opportunities.

Another Turkish officer spoke with great pride of Turkey's military achievements, especially at Galli-

poli. "We have been more successful than any other nation in this war. We have done most of the fighting. We saved Germany."

The Grand Vizier was right. The situation of Constantinople is unique. But it is this very situation that makes its possession the apple of Paris among the nations of Europe. Constantinople controls the exit of most of Russia's exports, just as New Orleans, in the hands of Spain, more than a century ago, controlled the mouth of the Mississippi, through which at that time three eighths of our exports must pass to the sea.

Russia is young, and her agriculture is primitive, yet she produces one fifth of the world's wheat, one fourth each of the world's potatoes and oats, nearly a third each of the world's beet-sugar and barley, and more than half of the world's rye. At the present time her greatest sources of wealth — coal, oil, and agriculture — are in the regions tributary to the Black Sea. All the huge exports from this region must pass through the Bosphorus, which is about as wide at Constantinople as the Hudson River is at New York City. The unhindered use of this trade route is absolutely essential to Russia, and that Russia should have it is very important to the world. The closing of the Bosphorus increases greatly the price of wheat in the world's markets.

In a little over two hundred years Russia has waged ten wars against Turkey.

To make the situation of Russia more vivid I will take a chapter from the history of our own country. In 1786, Jay, who was trying to negotiate a treaty with the first Spanish Minister to the United States, reported to Congress, after long and fruitless negotia-

tions, that our right to use the Mississippi would have to be secured "by arms or by treaty."

In a recent book, on "America's Foreign Relations" (Century Co., 1916), Willis Fletcher Johnson, of New York University, writes: —

> Passions ran high in Congress over the matter. Patrick Henry declared that he would "rather part with the Confederation than relinquish the navigation of the Mississippi." Madison, usually calm and philosophic, was roused to something like anger. Washington counseled patience and moderation, but his voice was lost in the tumult.
>
> Nor was that all. Treason began to rise in the Southwest.

Matters grew worse. There were ominous threats of secession in the Southwest. The people feared that the East would abandon them in the effort to secure free navigation of the Mississippi. These troubles continued, until finally France made a secret treaty with Spain for the acquisition of Louisiana with New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi. Napoleon secured this huge territory (nearly one million square miles, or one third of the present United States) in exchange for promising the Queen of Spain that her nephew should be made King of Tuscany. This treaty was kept secret, and the Spanish officials remained in nominal charge of Louisiana.

Finally Congress in 1803, voted two million dollars in a secret session "to enable the executive to commence with more effect a negotiation with the French and Spanish Governments relative to the purchase of the Island of New Orleans and the provinces of East and West Florida."

A few weeks later Congress authorized the call for eighty thousand volunteers.

Jefferson wrote to Livingston, American Minister in Paris: "The future destinies of our country hang on the event of this negotiation"; and to Dupont de Nemours: "The use of the Mississippi is so indispensable that we cannot one moment hesitate to hazard our existence for its maintenance."

I can best present the situation by quoting from a letter written by Jefferson in May, 1801, to Monroe, showing how the right to free access to the sea through the Mississippi affected his views as to the foreign policy of the United States: —

The cession of Louisiana and the Floridas by Spain to France works most sorely on the United States. On this subject the secretary of state has written to you fully; yet I cannot forbear recurring to it personally, so deep is the impression it makes on my mind. It completely reverses all the political relations of the United States, and will form a new epoch in our political course. Of all nations of any consideration, France is the one which, hitherto, has offered the fewest points on which we could have conflict of rights, and the most points of a communion of interests. From these causes we have ever looked to her as our natural friend, as one with whom we never could have an occasion of difference. Her growth, therefore, we viewed as our own, her misfortunes as ours.

New Orleans was to us what Constantinople is to Russia. Jefferson continues: —

There is on the globe one single spot, the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans, through which the produce of three eighths of our territory must pass to market, and from its fertility this region will ere long yield more than half of our whole produce, and contain more than half of our inhabitants. France, placing herself in that door, assumes to us the attitude of defiance. Spain might have retained it quietly for years. Her pacific dis-

position, her feeble state, would induce her to increase our facilities there so that her possession of the place would hardly be felt by us, and it would not, perhaps, be very long before some circumstances might arise which might make the cession of it to us the price of something of more worth to her. Not so can it ever be in the hands of France.

We can get an understanding of the vital importance of New Orleans from the extraordinary suggestions Jefferson made, which, if carried out, would completely reverse our friendships in Europe. He wrote: —

These circumstances render it impossible that France and the United States can long continue friends when they meet in so irritable a position. They, as well as we, must be blind if they do not see this, and we must be very improvident if we do not begin to make arrangements on that hypothesis. The day that France takes possession of New Orleans . . . seals the union of two nations who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation. We must turn all our attention to a maritime force.

The feeling of the people of the United States in regard to this matter is told by Professor Johnson in the book from which I have just quoted: —

Six months later, on October 16, 1802, either Morales, the Spanish Intendant, or Salcedo, the Spanish Governor, at New Orleans, arbitrarily and without warning revoked the American right to use that city as a port of deposit. That was the first step toward disclosing the terms of the treaty of San Ildefonso and toward turning Louisiana over to its new owners. The news of this did not reach Washington for several weeks. But when it did it created one of the most profound sensations the American Republic had thus far known. The whole country was swept with fiery tides of passion, amid which, strange to say, the one man who remained cool, calm, conservative, and master of himself was

the usually impressionable and impulsive Jefferson. In the West, in Illinois and Kentucky, the settlers were furious. Years before they had exercised immeasurable patience and forbearance in the face of great provocation, trusting to the promise that their interests would be protected and their rights would be vindicated. But now all seemed to be in vain. The treaty which secured their rights was wantonly repudiated and their vital interests were sacrificed.

As is well known, negotiation with Napoleon resulted in the Louisiana Purchase. France secured Louisiana in return for a promise that was never fulfilled. France never occupied Louisiana, but sold it to the United States. Napoleon said: —

> I have given England a maritime rival who will some day humble her pride. Sixty millions for a territory which we may not occupy for a single day!

The subsequent possession of Texas, New Mexico, and California was the direct outgrowth of the purchase of Louisiana.

The conflicting vital interests of Russia and Germany as to Constantinople and Asiatic Turkey constitute one of the great obstacles to an early peace.

Of even more importance to nations than territory is security. It can easily be seen, considering the fact that Germany at present, physically and militarily, occupies the territory from Hamburg to Bagdad, how slight was the possibility of peace from the efforts made in December, 1916, and January, 1917. For the security of the British Empire would be vitally threatened by the same achievement of Germany that prevents Russia from controlling the Bosphorus.

On the other hand, the prize Germany aims to secure to herself in Turkey is of dazzling importance. From

the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, including the Balkans, but excluding the occupied territories of France, Belgium, and Russia, there is a territory nearly half the size of the United States, with a present population of one hundred and sixty million, much of it under very primitive conditions, waiting only for science and organization to make it bloom.

This territory could furnish now fifteen million to twenty million soldiers, and its wealth and population would increase rapidly. Its communications for war and commerce are free from the dangers of the sea. Once in possession of this territory, Germany could choke Russia by simply closing the Baltic and the Bosphorus. With such an advantage she could make a singularly favorable commercial treaty with Russia, and perhaps, in time, even a treaty of alliance.

The territory which comprises the Turkish Empire includes cities and regions which successively in the history of the world have exercised great power and influence, — Babylon and Nineveh, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Bagdad. Within its boundaries lies the traditional site of the Garden of Eden. There, too, are the Holy Land and Jerusalem.

Perhaps the chief political objective of the Turkish Government is to get control of the Suez Canal and Egypt. Egypt is the most densely populated country in the world. With a cultivable area of ten thousand square miles, it has a population of nearly fourteen million, or almost double that of Belgium, which has an area of eleven thousand square miles.

The inhabitants of Egypt are probably the most easily oppressed of all peoples. From the earliest dawn of recorded history until the British possession of

Egypt, their history is an unvarying record of oppression and suffering, varied by methods that differed only in degrees of atrocity and cruelty. Under the benign and just rule of England, Egypt has prospered amazingly. Her population has doubled in thirty years.

The expulsion of the Armenians, with the appropriation of their properties (and the Armenians are very industrious), has temporarily increased the wealth of the Turks. But inasmuch as the Armenians were the principal producers of wealth in the country, the plunder taken from them will soon be exhausted. Egypt would be another and richer Armenia. Moreover, there are great numbers of Coptic Christians there, who would be robbed first. In Egypt, however, the Turks, when in power, robbed and oppressed their own fellow-religionists. The Turks are determined to get Egypt, and many of the most fanatical of the officials engaged in managing the deportation and destruction of the Armenians are Egyptians. Every publicist I talked to in Germany about Egypt said that it would go to Turkey.

It might be asserted that in such a case Germany would exercise an overlordship and would prevent cruelties and injustices in Egypt. That would be just as impossible as it now is for the Germans to prevent the Armenian deportations. The ruling Turks are very proud, and even now fret at the necessary German collaboration in Turkey. Germany could control Turkish policy only by war, and should Germany resort to war against Turkey, there are other nations that would seize the opportunity to drive German influence out of Turkey.

I spoke of the mass of literature I found in the hotel at Hamburg, dealing with Asiatic Turkey. I will give some idea of this literature.

Dr. Freiherr von Mackay ("The Quadruple Alliance and the World-Significance of the New Connexion between Europe and the East." Stuttgart, 1916): —

> The first and foremost direction for the blow to be struck by the new Quadruple Alliance is known and has been much discussed. Its point is defined in the phrase: "Ostend-Bagdad!" It is directed against Britain's supremacy of the seas and the chain of naval stations connecting the North Sea with India. It counters the London blue-water school with the principle: Waves are broken by the land.

Professor Roloff ("An Egyptian Expedition as a Weapon against England." Giessen, 1915) suggests that the expulsion of the British from Egypt would be Germany's greatest triumph. He continues: —

> Even if the British escape catastrophe in Egypt, their occupation of that country will bring them little profit and less peace of mind if Turkey emerges from this war strong and rejuvenated. In that case England would always have to reckon with a possible Mussulman attack on the Suez Canal and be compelled to detach a large portion of her forces to defend it; i.e., weaken herself in Europe.

Professor Alfred Hettner ("The Aims of our World-Policy," Berlin, 1915) expresses the General Turkish policy of Germany, which is to reorganize the Turkish Empire and make it so powerful that Egypt would be untenable for England. He says: —

> During the war, Turkey, in unison with the Central Empires, has defined her aims in regard to Egypt. It must become an integral part of the Ottoman Empire. . . .
>
> We can only pursue such aims as have Turkey's full

consent. Territorial aggrandizement is out of the question. It is questionable whether it will be possible to establish large settlements of German peasants. Without doubt Germany will be interested most of all in commercial undertakings, developing the means of communication and systems of irrigation, together with educative work in political, military, and cultural matters. . . .

Such a policy will give us a strong ally, whose strength will grow from year to year; an ally who will be of greater value to us than any colored African troops could ever be. At the same time it opens the way to Egypt and Persia, and through the Persian Gulf — where England's supremacy must be broken — to the Indian Ocean and the lands around it. . . .

Professor Düring says (September, 1915):—

On broad lines it is now quite clear what form the future Turkish Empire will assume. From Tripoli across to Persia and on the ridges of the Caucasus, German energy — without injury to the sovereignty of the Osmanic State — will coöperate in Turkey's renaissance and the development of her treasures.

In "The Fight for the Dardanelles" (Stuttgart, 1915) Herr Trampe says:—

When England — the European outsider who lags far behind Germany in national power, individual talent, and political strength — loses India, then her world-power will be broken. The ancient highroad of the world is the one which leads from Europe to India — the road used by Alexander — the highway which leads from the Danube via Constantinople to the valley of the Euphrates, and by Northern Persia, Herat, and Kabul to the Ganges. Every yard of the Bagdad Railway which is laid brings the owner of the railway nearer to India. What Alexander performed and Napoleon undoubtedly planned, can be achieved by a third treading in their footsteps. . . .

The spirit of history has determined, too, that in the cul-

tural war let loose by enemies filled with fear and hate for our State system, the Central Empires' towering superiority in cultural greatness shall beat back and vanquish the barbarous methods of our antagonists. . . .

Field-Marshal von Mackensen is paving the way indicated by Prince Eugène of Savoy; and the Young German Empire has undertaken the task which the Holy Roman Empire left as an unsolved heritage to the German nation.

Turkey seems so near to us; and the German nation is sacrificing blood and treasure for the sake of regulating conditions in the Balkans. The most striking and at the same time the most pleasing symptom, however, is that there are no protests at the turn events have taken. The conviction seems to have penetrated through the whole nation that it must be so — that we are not out for an adventure, but merely obeying an inward necessity, when we make the cause of Turkey and Bulgaria our own.

Professor Hettner ("The Aims of our World Policy," Berlin, 1915) writes: —

Now that our *Weltpolitik* has brought us into armed conflict with England, we must endeavor, in spite of Britain's power, to gain that which will be conducive to our welfare; and that is not a limitation to West Africa, but a sphere of interest or an empire which stretches across Africa from one ocean to the other. We will win our place in the sun, and to this end destroy England's world-domination, and keep Russia within her proper limits. Nor will we renounce the Pacific either to American or Japanese dominion. Until we have broken England's power we cannot be a great and free nation.

Professor Düring, in an article, "Germany and Turkey," writes: —

I spent fourteen years in the Orient just in the period when German interests and influence began to increase there. My great love for the country and its people has always led me to wish and hope that Turkey would rise to the rank of a first-class power with Germany's help.

And Professor Roloff follows up the idea: —

Turkey has become a kind of "life insurance" for Germany against the English danger. For, in case Britain eventually attacked Germany, the reply would be an attack through Turkey against Egypt. A beginning has also been made in the tremendous task of awakening new life in the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris, the once fruitful Mesopotamia. For many years past a British company has been engaged on this gigantic problem. They have endeavored, by reconstructing the decayed irrigation canals, building new dams, and extending the irrigation system, to revive in this dead land the same or even greater fertility than it enjoyed thousands of years ago. Now we may safely assume that German engineers will complete the work of transforming and opening up these enormous territories.

Another task to which the Turks must devote themselves is the development of their sea power. Germany too must acquire a naval station on Turkish soil. . . .

Of what use would Gibraltar, the Mediterranean, and the Suez Canal be to England, if our land-ways to Persia and India are secure beyond the range of the biggest naval guns? . . .

The Bagdad Railway consists of a single track; construction is proceeding simultaneously at both ends of each gap; and the entire railway should be completed in 1917, when, as we are told and can well believe, and as Hans Rohde writes (in "Deutschland in Vorderasien," Berlin, 1916): —

It will produce economic, political, and cultural results the extent of which cannot now be imagined. In a very short time direct communication by rail will be established between Constantinople and Bagdad; while during the next generation towns and villages will spring up along the line, and along the lesser railways which will be built to complete the network. These will provide for the agricul-

tural and industrial development of that ancient seat of culture to the mutual profit of Turkey and Germany.

The sword had to decide the fate of Near Asia, and a decision has fallen, unless unforeseen events intervene. Germany will not be limited to the sphere of influence formerly alloted to her, but in future she will devote her energies to Armenia, Syria, and Mesopotamia in the interests of German capitalists and merchants. In this manner the way will be kept open which the war indicated and which, together with our allies, we have fought for and won — the way that leads from Berlin, via Vienna — Sofia — Constantinople — Bagdad, to the Persian Gulf, and has become the vital nerve in our economic life and our policy.

Before the war there were about one thousand schools in Turkey maintained by other nations as follows: —

France	530	schools,	with	about	54,000	pupils
America	273	"	"	"	18,000	"
England	126	"	"	"	10,000	"
Italy	67	"	"	"	5,000	"
Germany	23	"	"	"	3,000	"

All these schools would be suppressed or either Germanized or Moslemized.

The huge expectations of Germany, an anonymous writer in Mesopotamia ("The Land of the Future," Berlin, 1916) says, after a few decades of intensive culture Turkey will be able to supply the deficit in German requirements as regards grains, fruit, cotton, wool, petroleum, fat, etc.

But [he adds] this will only be possible if German officials and German capital are given complete freedom of action, and all foreign undertakings — above all, English and French projects — are excluded. Hand in hand with this demand must go the work of developing the means of communication, colonization plans, and the securing of the

power of the State by a proper organization of the administrative and military establishments.

Although it would take five Egypts to make the State of Iowa, its population of fourteen millions is equal to nearly seventy per cent of the Turkish Empire. What a Belgium or Armenia it would be for Turkey!

Recently Mr. Arthur Henderson, a member of the British Cabinet, said: —

> Suppose we had a peace on the basis of *status quo ante bellum*. You forget that while Germany has failed to conquer her enemies, she has conquered her allies; Germany has subordinated Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria wholly to her will, and "Middle Europe" has become a political reality. It is impossible to return to the *status quo* as between Germany and her enemies. We cannot tolerate so strong and so strongly placed a military force as would be constituted by Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria effectively united under German control, nor can we do so even in view of international aspirations after peace for the future.

The fate of the inhabitants of Egypt depends on the outcome of this war. The loss of the Suez Canal would be a capital disaster to Great Britain. We may, therefore, conclude that neither of the great belligerents will give up the fight for the control of Egypt and the Suez Canal, which means so much, until the exhaustion of one side or the other. To Great Britain it is a fight to prevent the greatest disaster in her history; to Germany, a fight for achieving a sure foundation for world-dominion; and to the ruling class of Turkey, it is a fight for vast riches and power.

CHAPTER XXIV

OUR SISTER FRANCE

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" The significance of this question is common knowledge to all peoples. But until my visit to France last summer I never thought of the converse, "What shall it profit a man (or a nation) if he lose the whole world and save his own soul?" — and in a way that is what has happened to France. For all France, every man, woman, and child, has made the ultimate surrender of personal ambition, property, life, freedom from pain, *everything*, in behalf of France. "My life is but a moment in the life of France, France is eternal," an officer said in dying; and that is the spirit of all. The story of France is written in the blood of her children, who died that France might live.

The result of this devotion is such a revealing of the very soul of France that for the first time one realizes that behind the achievements of France, — the mother of democracies, and of human freedom, the mother of surpassing beauty in art and literature, the mother of gracious and noble human intercourse, — there always was something incomparably greater and more lovable than her achievements, and that was the soul itself of France.

It was not a new France that was revealed at Verdun or at the Marne. It was *France*. The France without whose contributions even of the last one hundred and fifty years the world would be greatly poorer.

It must never be forgotten that a capital issue of the war is the fate of France. Had Germany won the battle of the Marne, and had England held aloof from the conflict, France, which had survived the calamities of 1870–71, would have lost the nourishing atmosphere of freedom that has enabled her so wonderfully to enrich human civilization.

The miracle of France in this war is that, with almost fatal handicaps, she has surpassed all other nations in economic and military organization and efficiency. And this is due only in part to the universal devotion of her people: it is mainly because in the ultimate assessment of ordeal by war France has shown herself superior in force and genius.

The most thrilling page in her history is open to the eyes of all the world. It is the battle-field of Verdun. In this one battle of Verdun, in six months the loss of France exceeded the losses of the Union armies in our whole Civil War. The battle of Verdun, involving as much fighting as all our Civil War, had hundreds of Thermopylæs, hundreds of Gettysburgs, but each infinitely more terrible than the world had ever seen before. Most battles last one or two days. This battle has lasted more than a year and is not yet ended. In certain exposed places death was almost inevitable, but the French youth, regiment after regiment, went forward to hold them till death. No surrender, no retreat. It was their mad bravery and divine courage that held Verdun. It was the greatest test a nation ever endured, and the youth of France never faltered there, but has gone on day after day, week after week, month after month, facing death, mutilation, and torture in their most terrible form. For

many death came in being burned to a crisp by liquid fire, hundreds and hundreds were buried alive in their trenches. Many of those who survived the liquid fire were brought back with face and eyes destroyed by the flames.

The battle of the Marne and the battle of Verdun give us a true measure of the character of the French and an indication of their purpose. To know the story of Verdun is to know the mind of France, and the character of the French. For war is the most searching test of a people, and the battle of Verdun is one of the most terrible ever fought.

In other days heroism was a matter of hours, sharp, thrilling, unexpected. Most men can face death for a brief space, but the youth who saved France knew beforehand what was to come, and lived and moved days, weeks, and months, meeting death in its most mysterious and terrible forms. "He was at Verdun" will be the ultimate badge of courage for generations to come.

For generations to come the youth of all countries will visit Verdun and see the land made holy by the blood and anguish of hundreds of thousands of young men, who revealed qualities and endurance surpassing all possible anticipation: who showed as never before what France is, in courage, self-denial, nobility, and infinite endurance.

As regiment after regiment marched up the single road that was available, I was told that no one smiled, but no one hesitated. All the men, munitions, and provisions went up this single road, all the wounded were brought back by this road. It is called the *Via Sacra.*

Sometime, perhaps, the youth of other lands may build a monument on this road.

I quote this little tribute from Maurice Maeterlinck:

In this horrible war, whose stakes are the salvation and the future of mankind, let us first of all salute our wonderful sister France, who is supporting the heaviest burden and who, for more than eleven months, having broken its first and most formidable onslaught, has been struggling, foot by foot, at closest quarters, without faltering, without remission, with a heroic smile, against the most formidable organization of devastation that the world has seen since man first learnt the history of the planet on which he lives. We have here a revelation of qualities and virtues surpassing all that we expected from a nation, which nevertheless had accustomed us to expect of her all that goes to make the beauty and glory of humanity.

The Paris correspondent of the Christiania "Tidens Tegn," Dr. Bjarne Eide, describes the spirit of Paris on the day of the National Fête: —

Once more it is France that leads the way in the fight for all humanity; it is France once more that offers whatever it holds dearest on the altar of the common good. . . . And France is much greater and stands much higher on this 14th of July than on that other, a century and a quarter ago. It has a mastery over itself such as it has never had before, and it sees clearly and in sharp outlines the ideal it is fighting for.

One needs to be here, in Paris, in order to be sensible of the mighty and inspiring passion which sweeps through the people, one and all. And when I look at the map of the world I ask myself from what quarter a great ideal movement is to come if not from France? Is there any people in the world so willing as the French to risk everything in a striving towards ideals?

It is the threatening vision of the new world-Bastille that has brought them all together in the realization that as surely as the old Bastille had to fall, so surely must all Bas-

tilles be overthrown, for they have no place in man's life upon earth. . . .

There is no day which will then be held more fitting for the world's Festival of Freedom than the Frenchmen's 14th of July.

Here is an extract from a letter found on the body of Jean Chatanay, reservist lieutenant killed at Vermelles, October 15, 1914, that reveals the spirit of France: —

My darling [he wrote to his wife], I am writing this letter in case of need, for we do not know. . . . If it reaches you, it is because France will have had need of me to the end. You must not weep, for I swear to you, I shall die happy if I am called to give my life for her.

My only anxiety is the difficult situation in which you will find yourself, you and the children. . . . How shall you be able to assure proper support for the dear babies and yourself? Fortunately, you can depend upon your former experience as teacher and on the entire coöperation of all my friends. How I wish that some possible solution will be arranged for you!

Concerning the education of the children, I am not disturbed; you will direct it as I myself would have done. I hope that they will become as independent as I would have enabled them to if I could have remained. The only great trouble will be Zette, for it will be hard, if not impossible, to live in Paris. . . . Caress the dear little ones for their papa; tell them that he has gone on a long, very long journey, without ceasing to love them, without ceasing to think of them; and that he protects them from afar. I would like to have Cotte, at least, remember me. . . . There will also be a little child, so little that I shall not have known it. If it is a son, I hope that he will be a doctor, at least if France no longer needs officers. Say to him, when he is old enough to understand, *that I have given my life for a great ideal, to reorganize and strengthen my country.*

I believe that I have said all that is essential. Au revoir,

my dear one, my love. *Promise me that you will not blame France if she requires me to give my entire self.* Promise me also to console mamma and papa; and tell the little girls that their father, although he is far away, never ceases to watch over them and to love them dearly. We will one day be reunited, I trust, reunited beside that One who guides our destinies, and who has given me the blessing of being near to you and of having known such happpiness in you. Poor darling, I myself have not the time to dwell long enough on our love, so magnificently enduring and so brave.

Au revoir, until the great, the true reunion. Be brave.

Your Jean.

This is a short chapter for a great nation.

When Lincoln was assassinated the common people of France, and many famous people like Victor Hugo, contributed two cents each — the amount was small, so that many might share in the privilege of contributing — to have a medal made to send to Mrs. Lincoln. The medal was placed in the hands of the American Ambassador to be sent to Mrs. Lincoln, with this message: "Say to Mrs. Lincoln that in this little box is the heart of France."

CHAPTER XXV

THE LESSON TO OUR OWN COUNTRY

It was my intention to devote a chapter to "Europe after the War," with special reference to the effect on our industrial situation. Much has been said and written on this subject. But I find I have no heart to deal with what will happen to us. When one knows the tragedy of Europe, it is difficult to study our own particular industrial interests.

There is, however, one lesson for us: the parallel between Turkey and Mexico in their international aspects. Those two nations have about the same area. The inhabitants of neither country are able to organize a government that will insure themselves justice and security. Neither country is able to develop its resources or to protect itself. Both countries will inevitably be dominated by more powerful nations.

The history of Mexico will duplicate that of Turkey. In time Mexico is bound to be a prize to be fought for. I make this statement having no nation or nations in my mind. The world is small, the hunger and power of the leading industrial nations are great. There are many similarities in detail between Turkey and Mexico. A great military and naval power, controlling Mexico, would dominate the small Central American nations and the Panama Canal.

A century is a long time in the history of the world; it is a moment in the history of biology and evolution. Thousands of years would be a short period for

the Mexican people to develop the intelligence and power necessary to enable them to be masters of their fate.

Speaking of New Orleans, in 1801, Thomas Jefferson said, "There is on the globe one single spot, the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy." Much more would this be true of the powerful nation that might secure a sufficient foothold in Mexico to develop such wealth and power as to be able to retain control.

In some way the United States should make an industrial and political alliance with Mexico.

There are more than twelve millions in Mexico who are powerless to get for themselves ordinary security and justice. Mexico is the greatest unguarded body of treasure on the globe. It is, moreover, a mass of treasure that constitutes an unguarded entrance into the United States.

It is the duty of the Government of the United States to concern itself with the Mexican question in the light of the Turkish question in Europe.

The United States is blessed above all nations in its natural security. In a recent book the noted naval authority, Archibald Hurd, speaking of the British Empire, says: —

> By the power of the sea the British Empire came into being, and with the loss of that power it will pass away again. It is all a matter of ships — ships of war and ships of commerce. The former are the life lines of the greatest empire the world has ever seen, an empire without a threatened land frontier, whose unity can be maintained only so long as the British fleet commands the seas, which are its highways. . . . The British Empire floats on the two British Navies — the Royal Navy and the Merchant Navy —

and once they are permitted to decline that empire's doom is sealed.

Compared with the nations of Europe we are singularly fortunate. But we should lose half our natural security if Mexico should fall into the hands of a powerful nation.

The good fortune that is ours, that gives us a continent in area and access to the sea, cannot be overestimated.

In his Annual Message to Congress, December 1, 1862, Lincoln said in part: —

A nation may be said to consist of its territory, its people, and its laws. The territory is the only part which is of certain durability. "One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth forever." It is of the first importance to duly consider and estimate this ever enduring part. That portion of the earth's surface which is owned and inhabited by the people of the United States is well adapted to be the home of one national family, and it is not well adapted for two or more. Its vast extent and its variety of climate and productions are of advantage in this age for one people, whatever they might have been in former ages. . . .

There is no line, straight or crooked, suitable for a national boundary, upon which to divide. Trace through from east to west upon the line between the free and the slave country, and we shall find a little more than one third of its length are rivers, easy to be crossed, and populated, or soon to be populated, thickly upon both sides; while nearly all of its remaining length are merely surveyors' lines, over which people may walk back and forth without any consciousness of their presence. No part of this line can be made any more difficult to pass, by writing it down on paper or parchment as a national boundary.

But there is another difficulty. The great interior region, bounded east by the Alleghanies, north by the British

Dominions, west by the Rocky Mountains, and south by the line along which the culture of corn and cotton meets, . . . already has above ten millions of people, and will have fifty millions within fifty years, if not prevented by any political folly or mistake. It contains more than one third of the country owned by the United States — certainly more than one million of square miles. A glance at the map shows that, territorially speaking, it is the great body of the Republic. In the production of provisions, grains, grasses, and all which proceed from them, this great interior region is naturally one of the most important in the world.

And yet this region has no seacoast, touches no ocean anywhere. As part of one nation, its people now find, and may forever find, their way to Europe by New York, to South America and Africa by New Orleans, and to Asia by San Francisco. But separate our common country into two nations, as designed by the present rebellion, and every man of this great interior region is thereby cut off from some one or more of these outlets — not perhaps by a physical barrier, but by embarrassing and onerous trade regulations.

Our national strife springs not from our permanent part, not from the land we inhabit, not from our national homestead. There is no possible severing of this but would multiply and not mitigate evils among us. In all its adaptations and aptitudes it demands union and abhors separation.

Our strife pertains to ourselves — to the passing generations of men; and it cannot without convulsion be hushed forever with the passing of one generation. . . .

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this Administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. . . . We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope on earth. . . .

"We of this Congress and this Administration" can prevent serious trouble to this nation and this continent more easily than following governments. Every year will make the problem more difficult, and if neglected nothing but a war, and a war under modern conditions, will solve the Mexican question and re-establish our natural security.

Lincoln was one of our greatest statesmen.

Let us glance back at the early deeds of our country, when the United States was young. Our country was a mere infant. Not so the men of that day. They were as concerned with the well-being of the Republic a hundred years after their time as they were with the immediate problems. For security they made the Louisiana Purchase. When the treaty of purchase was signed, Livingston remarked to Monroe: "We have lived long, but this is the noblest work of our lives."

When Tripoli made demands on us that Jefferson characterized as unfounded either in right or compact, "I sent," he said, in his first Annual Message to Congress December 8, 1801, "a small squadron of frigates into the Mediterranean, with assurances to that power of our sincere desire to remain in peace, but with orders to protect our commerce against the threatened attack."

This "small squadron" settled matters satisfactorily. In his Annual Message, November 8, 1804, Jefferson said: —

The Bey of Tunis having made requisitions unauthorized by our treaty, their rejection has produced from him some expressions of discontent. But to those who expect us to calculate whether a compliance with unjust demands will

not cost us less than a war we must leave as a question for calculation for them also whether to retire from unjust demands will not cost them less than a war.

We, not Europe, settled the Barbary pirates. And when Greece was fighting for release from Turkish rule President Monroe expressed the ardent sympathy of this country for the aspiration of Greece.

Madison, also, in a letter to Monroe, said: —

> Will it not be honorable in our country to invite the British Government to extend the "avowed disapprobation" of the project against the Spanish colonies to the enterprise of France against Spain herself, and even to join in some declaratory act in behalf of the Greeks?

Commenting on this and other statements of the Elder Statesmen, Colonel Harvey writes in the "North American Review" (February, 1917): —

> So here was this thoughtful and scholarly "Father of the Constitution" suggesting that we should make an alliance with Great Britain for the purpose not alone of protecting the South American Republics from re-subjugation, but also of intervention — Anglo-American intervention — between France and Spain, and between Turkey and Greece. For while he spoke primarily of mere words of "disapprobation" of France's aggressions upon Spain, and of a mere "declaratory act" in favor of Greece, he recognized the fact that such declarations might imply a pledge to follow them up with war; in which case, he said, "we ought to compare the good to be done with the little injury to be apprehended to the United States, shielded as their interests would be by the power and the fleets of Great Britain united with their own." In short, we were to join Great Britain in an alliance for waging war against France for the protection of Spain and against Turkey for the liberation of Greece! Surely, there was no "policy of isolation" in Madison's mind.

Let us consider the magnificent gesture with which the baby giant of the West said to the powerful nations of Europe that all the Americas must hereafter be free from aggression on their part. The greatest and most beneficent act of statesmanship in a hundred years was the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine, which neutralized the Western Hemisphere. Our country did this in its babyhood. In that far-away time we said to Russia that she must not colonize below the latitude of fifty-four degrees, and later we purchased Alaska. We recognized what all can see now, that the Pacific will in time be Europeanized.

Our Elder Statesmen concerned themselves with the preservation of human right.

Until August, 1914, the United States enjoyed the reputation made by the great Statesmen. The names of Washington and Lincoln meant something in the world. "What will America think?" meant something.

We cannot too often fix our minds on the incredible crimes Germany has perpetrated and is perpetrating in Belgium.

Professor Karl Ballod, in Schmoller's "Jahrbuch für Gesetzgeburg, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft" (1916), says: "The requisitions made in Belgium have more than compensated the losses incurred by Germany as a result of the Russian invasion of East Prussia." Going into details, he states that three million soldiers have received, from Belgium and Northern France, at least 4000 gr. of meat, 50 gr. of butter or fat, 60 gr. of bread, 600 gr. of potatoes per day and per head. The total equals 44 per cent of the total consumption of Germany in meat, 6 per cent of her total consumption in bread and potatoes.

Let us take just one little village, Middleburg, with 850 inhabitants. Here are the requisitions for six weeks: —

It had to give up to the invader, within six weeks, 100 pigs, 100,000 kg. of wheat and rye, 50,000 kg. of beans, 50,000 kg. of oats, 150,000 kg. of straw. When this requisition was made, the inhabitants had already delivered to the German troops 50 cows, 35 pigs, 100 hens, 1600 kg. of oats, and 1600 kg. of straw.

In an article by Ferdinand Hoff, member of the Reichstag, occurs this statement: —

The needs and the interests of our unparalleled army and of the German Fatherland must, of course, be cared for first of all, and we ought to see that the important economic and other forces as well as the plants of the country [Belgium] shall be utilized for the benefit of either.

Meantime hundreds of thousands of little children are underfed and are rapidly reaching a condition which will irretrievably destroy their health for life. Millions in Belgium suffer for lack of sufficient food.

Let us not forget that now in 1917 these things are happening.

Deportation scene in Warsaw, reported in London Times, January 31, 1917

More crushing and agonizing than this increasing famine, however, is the moral oppression, the menace of which is over the country. The "Courts of Blood" perform their work without cessation. Firing parties are always at work. In the neighborhood of Pilawa absolutely innocent people have been shot. Search is made continually in private houses to discover a trace of connection with "the enemies" — meaning the Allies. Lamentable and heartrending scenes, which leave behind them in the innermost being a hatred which nothing can uproot, are to be seen everywhere.

Before my departure I saw with my own eyes how the Germans proceed in the sweeping away of men. At night cordons of troops surrounded a working-class quarter at Warsaw not far from the Nadwislanska Station with loaded rifles. "Alles heraus!" (all out) ordered a sergeant. Then occurred a tragic scene. The soldiers chose here and there those men and women whom they thought suitable, separated brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and compelled those whom they declared good for slavery to leave immediately. Thus more than one hundred thousand men and women were removed from the part of the country under the Government of Warsaw. Young women and girls alike are torn from their family and collected in groups, pell-mell with women of evil life, with the lowest of their sex. The most beautiful women are reserved for the officers. Deportation trains leave the country every day for Germany. There, as in Poland, the hardest labor is imposed on the deported with in addition a severe régime of terrorism and of punishments. My unhappy fellow countrymen are compelled to lie on the ground without covering, exposed to all the hardships of the cold weather.

In Poland there is a régime of misery which no civilized people would dare to impose upon its worst criminals. Tuberculosis is consequently beginning to make frightful ravages among the emaciated population. But in spite of everything, the energy of the unhappy people is not giving way. Little account is made of fines, espionage, prison. They mock the enemy, whom they detest. They write Polish songs which they sing to German tunes. To the air of "Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles," they sing: "Niemiec, Niemiec, co za scierwa," which means, "Germany, Germany, ferocious beast." And the Germans hear the air without understanding the words, and approve, flattered.

The new Turkish victims

Information received in authoritative quarters in London shows that the Turks are carrying out a deliberate policy of destruction of Arabs, with the object apparently of ex-

terminating them as they have endeavored to exterminate the Armenians.

In pursuance of this object, they surrounded the whole region of the Lebanon with a military cordon, thus preventing food getting through, with the result that about half the Christian and Druse Arabs in that zone have died of starvation. They have devastated Syria and Palestine on the pretext of getting fuel, and have ruined olive trees and orange gardens. They have deported large numbers of the most illustrious Arab families, and have hanged on the flimsiest pretext all Arab leaders on whom they could lay their hands, no matter whether they were pro- or anti-Turk. The agricultural population has been pressed more heavily with conscription than any other section of the Turkish people, and has been exposed on all the worst fronts. Such individuals as have been left behind have been infected with typhus by the deliberate sending into the villages of typhus-stricken Armenians to act as carriers of the disease. Fortunately, however, Arab vitality is very strong.

Let us realize that the colossal thefts of Germany in Belgium consist in robbing the farmer of his cows and pigs and horses, the manufacturer of his machinery, raw material, and manufactured goods, the merchant of his stock-in-trade. It is individual robbery of the inhabitants of a nation against which Germany had no claims. The murder and torture and enslavement of the people of Belgium was killing innocent men, women, and children, capturing and dragging into slavery men and women and boys and girls. It constitutes at once the greatest crime and greatest menace against ordinary human right. What would Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Lincoln have done, judging by history?

To-day America is concerned with the destruction of law, the degradation of decency, and the infinite

torture and suffering of the people of Belgium, Poland, France, and Armenia.

The imploring eyes and beseeching hands of the oppressed are turned toward America, and during the early months of the martyrdom of Belgium and Armenia, they turned their agonized faces to the great Republic of the West, the Republic of Washington and Lincoln.

We must thank God for the American, Hoover, and his associates, who saved Belgium from immediate starvation. The most touching thing I saw in all Europe was one of many expressions of gratitude of the Belgians to America. In the shop-windows of many towns I saw cushion covers fashioned from the little sacks that contained the flour sent from America. On these sacks were the names of mills in Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, and many other States. But while the flour came from America, it was mostly paid for by other nations. The American people's total contribution equals nine cents each.

I quote herewith a statement made by Lord Robert Cecil: —

> Mr. Hoover and his American colleagues for more than two years have sacrificed every personal interest to this great humanitarian enterprise.
>
> It is they who have dealt daily, hourly, with the Foreign Office here, with the German authorities in Brussels, and with the German Headquarters in Northern France. They have been constant intermediaries in a series of most arduous international negotiations, and it is they who have built up the elaborate system of guarantees which made the continuance of the work possible for twenty-eight months, and which stands to-day as a bulwark between the Belgian people and the invaders.

Now, I am not going to pay any tribute to their business organization or their efficiency, as wonderful as these things have been. The mere fact that for twenty-eight months they have kept alive ten million people without a single serious hitch in the machinery of purchase, transport, and distribution shows what their organization has been. But this any observer can judge as well as I.

I do not emphasize the slaughter of Americans in the Lusitania crime.

Let us read what Jefferson said: "In a government bottomed on the will of all, the life and liberty of every individual citizen become interesting to all." And we can imagine what Jefferson would have done.

How far off seem Washington's words when he said:

The laws of nations make part of the laws of this and of every other civilized nation. They consist of those rules for regulating the conduct of nations toward each other, which, resulting from right reason, receive their obligations from that principle and from general assent and practice.

CHAPTER XXVI

HEROIC VOICES

A YOUNG Irish girl, speaking of her brother who had been wounded twice, and had received no furlough, said: "I am always afraid that word may come he is killed, and I don't know how I could tell my mother." She spoke of others of her young companions who were at the front. Then, referring to a conversation in which they were speaking of the end of the war, she said, "A friend of mine said, 'Yes, you will see the end of the war, but I won't.' So many feel that way."

Will Irwin said, "I was photographing a regiment as it marched to Verdun, and a French youth called out, 'You are photographing the dead.'"

Then the Irish girl spoke of one and another of her friends who had gone, feeling that they would never see England again, and there came a look into her eyes that was beyond tears, and reminded me of something I had seen in the railway station at Manchester. When a train full of soldiers was just pulling out, "Such a train goes every day toward the South," a man remarked to me. But as the train left, I looked at the host of women and girls who had come to bid farewell. I saw almost no tears, but there was a look of tender, yearning admiration, almost reverence, and above all of eager longing and *mothering*. But no tears, and when I saw the look in the eyes of the young Irish girl, there came to my mind the words, "And He shall wipe away all tears from their eyes"; only not as I had understood the words. Here is a people beyond tears.

One afternoon I noticed a great throng of people in front of Charing Cross Station. In a moment an ambulance passed; inside a soldier waved his hand to the cheering of the people. He was cared for by a nurse.

Every few seconds an ambulance would come out of the station with its one or two soldiers, and the great concourse of people would welcome them and throw flowers to them. Those soldiers had been through the hell at the front, and all over the Kingdom the trains brought back to their people the maimed and the broken, day by day, in return for the magnificent youth who had marched away with such bravery and power.

This war has no illusions. The youth who go forth to such conditions as were never imagined before, know what they will find and endure.

Many letters are written to be sent home only if the writer is killed. I print two such letters: —

"But we shall live forever"

A soldier boy's last letter

(*Lieutenant Eric L. Townsend, twenty years old*)

Sept. 8, 1916.

Dearest Mother and Father: —

You are reading this letter because I have gone under.

Of course I know you will be terribly cut up, and that it will be a long time before you get over it, but get over it you must. You must be imbued with the spirit of the navy and the army to "carry on." You will still have dear little Donald, who is safe, at any rate for some while. If he should ever have to go on active service I somehow feel that his invariable good luck will bring him through.

You must console yourselves with the thought that I am happy, whereas if I had lived — who knows?

Remember the saying attributed to Solon, "Call no man happy till he is dead." Thanks to your self-sacrificing

love and devotion I have had a happy time all my life. Death will have delivered me from experiencing unhappiness.

It has always seemed to me a very pitiful thing what little difference the disappearance of a man makes to any institution, even though he may have played a very important rôle. A moment's regret, a moment's pause for readjustment, and another man steps forward to carry on, and the machine clanks onward with scarce a check. The death of the leader of the nation is less even than a seven days' wonder. To a very small number is given to live in history; their number is scarcely one in ten millions. To the rest it is only granted to live in their united achievements.

But for this war I and all the others would have passed into oblivion like the countless myriads before us. We should have gone about our trifling business, eating, drinking, sleeping, hoping, marrying, giving in marriage, and finally dying with no more achieved than when we were born, with the world no different for our lives. Even the cattle in the field fare no worse than this. They, too, eat, drink, sleep, bring forth young, and die, leaving the world no different from what they found it.

But we shall live forever in the results of our efforts.

We shall live as those who by their sacrifice won the great war. Our spirits and our memories shall endure in the proud position Britain shall hold in the future. The measure of life is not its span, but the use made of it. I did not make much use of my life before the war, but I think I have done so now.

One sometimes hears people say, when a young man is killed, "Poor fellow, cut off so early, without ever having had a chance of knowing and enjoying life!" But for myself, thanks to all that both of you have done, I have crowded into twenty years enough pleasures, sensations, and experiences for an ordinary lifetime. Never brilliant, sometimes almost a failure in anything I undertook, my sympathies and my interests somehow or other — why, I cannot tell — were so wide that there was scarcely an amusement, an occupation, a feeling which I could not

appreciate. And, as I have said, of most of these I had tasted.

I don't suppose I ever met anybody who was not my superior in knowledge or achievement in one particular subject; but there his knowledge and his interest ended; whereas my interests comprised nearly the whole field of human affairs and activities. And that is why it is no hardship for me to leave the world so young.

Well, I have talked a lot of rot which must have given you great pain to read and which will not bring you much comfort. I had intended to try and say words of comfort, but that scarcely being possible, it has drifted into a sort of confession of faith.

To me has been given the easier task; to you is given the more difficult — that of living in sorrow. Be of good courage that at the end you may give a good account.

Kiss Donald for me. Adieu, best of parents.

Your loving son,

ERIC.

A letter written by a schoolmaster from Sousse, Algeria, on the evening of the assault in which he fell

My dear little Mamma: —

I hope that you will never receive this letter, for if it comes some day it will be because I shall have gone to rejoin grandfather, papa, and my dear little brother.

This idea of death does not terrify me the least in the world; if I fall it will be for France while doing my duty, as so many men are doing at this moment. You are the only one for whom I am anxious; and I ask, "What will become of my poor mamma?"

If it should happen that I die, this is what you must do: To begin with you must have and keep perfect calm. Keep all your self-possession and do not go through the streets crying in your despair. Your suffering will be calm and dignified.

Next, you will go to Coulonges, or rather to Luché-Touarsais, to the tomb of papa; you will tell him that both his

sons died doing their duty, and that his son-in-law did the same. Father will be content to know that his big Rudolph and his little Émile fell on the field of honor. You will tell him also that Rudolph fell wearing his epaulettes facing the enemy and at the head of his men. He will be happy, our dear father, and you, dear mamma, will have the satisfaction of having given birth to men of worth.

You will go back to your work at the station of Chef-Boutonne, and you will stay there until the time when you shall think yourself weary enough and to have worked enough to rest yourself. Then you will return to Alsace to be a Frenchwoman again, and when you are at Thann or at Strassbourg you will tell yourself that it is because your sons have contributed to give back our dear provinces to France.

Let this thought be sweet to your heart! It will be a consolation in your old age, which will be very long.

I wish and desire for you always good courage and confidence. The sacrifice once accepted, joy in resignation makes us strong.

You will thrust far from you all anger against any, whosoever it may be. You will not be jealous of mothers who shall have kept their children alive. If you sometimes sigh when you see my brother's comrades or mine, remember that your sons suffer no more and that their glorious death is well worth the paltry existence of those who remain.

You promise me faithfully, do you not? If I should not come back again you will tell yourself that the last thoughts of your big son were for you and for Blanche and that from the Paradise of the brave I will watch over you both.

Some kind kisses, then, courage and strength of heart in life and in death! Your big son who loves you well.

RUDOLPH.

Farm of Berthonval
(Pas-de-Calais)

The following letter is printed in a volume entitled "The German Spirit," by Kuno Francke. I often noticed in the eyes of the young soldiers going to the front, just such a look as is described in this letter.

It is from a widow living near Lake Constance, whose eldest son, a young Uhlan who volunteered fresh from the *Gymnasium*, had come home on furlough for the Christmas holidays: —

On the twenty-fourth I rode to Constance to fetch our Christmas surprise, our dear tall Uhlan who was allowed to spend three whole days with us. It was a wonderful time for us. The children dragged him about everywhere, from the cellar to the attic, from the garden into the field. It was a joy to see him playing for them gay riders' songs on the piano, whistling tunes to the guitar, etc. But he has grown very serious. A veil lies over his youthful face; and there is something touchingly protecting in the way in which he behaves toward the children. His features in repose are strangely sad; and strangely mature he seems when he talked, so reservedly and yet so understandingly, with a neighbor who had just heard of the death of his only son. There were three steamers full of reservists when, on the third day, I accompanied him across the lake. Some fifty people were at the pier and waved good-bye. A young lad next to us on the steamer, who had kept up waving back a long time, broke into despairing sobs when his aged mother vanished out of sight. But they all spoke firmly and with wonderful elevation about our beloved Fatherland. It helped me to keep myself in hand. And now — as God wills.

Here is a little letter which gives a glimpse of what the universal sentence to death means: —

April 14, 1916.

To-day is my nineteenth birthday. How shall I celebrate it? By rain and artillery fire, crouching in an underground hole like a mole. To be only nineteen and to have been seventeen months in the war! Where shall I celebrate my twentieth anniversary?

Meanwhile he was taken prisoner April 15.

From many sources I have collected these little stories of reality: —

The most trying days at Rheims were those when the troops of the invaders occupied the city. A few grief-stricken neighbors were gathered for prayer in the small quarters. Suddenly some one was heard knocking at the window. The adjutant opened it, and saw a German soldier.

At sight of the praying group the man drew back, uttering excuses. But the adjutant, who did not know a word of German, beckoned him to stay, and then, from his coat pocket he drew forth a photograph of his wife and children, and began to sob as he tried to make the officers understand that he too was a converted man!

Captain Robinson was in charge of a British vessel which, ignoring a signal to take to the boats, was shelled and chased by a German submarine. At last the steering-gear was destroyed and the ship was compelled to stop. The captain gave Betty, a Pomeranian ten months old, to the second officer to put into the boat, but in passing the dog down one of the crew dropped it into the water.

When Captain Robinson entered the boat Betty could be seen swimming toward the submarine. Without hesitation the captain jumped into the water, swam about a quarter of a mile, and put the dog on his shoulder. As the submarine had by this time drawn up to him, he laid hold of her in order to recover his breath. The commander then said, in imperfect English, "I make up my mind to blow up your boats for your not stopping ship, but for you saving little dog."

A young officer was reported wounded and missing. After some weeks his parents received a letter through Denmark to this effect. It was written in German, from a sergeant in the German Army, "somewhere in France": —

Dear Sir: — I have promised your son to write this to you. By the good guidance of God I found your

son in a shell-hole wounded. He had lain there two days. As the Lord Jesus Christ bids us love our enemies, I ministered to him, bound up his wounds, and gave him bread and wine. In a short time he revived, and I, with some of my men, carried him to a place of safety. He is now in hospital being well cared for.

A Salvationist sailor's self-sacrifice is related in "Deeds of Love and Courage" — the social report just published by the Salvation Army.

It was told by a sailor who entered the Salvation Army Hall at Sheerness.

I was on the —— (one of the cruisers torpedoed in the North Sea) when she sank. I, and another member of the crew, a Salvationist, had been swimming about in the water for two hours or more and were almost exhausted, when just as we were about to give up we saw a piece of spar, we made for it, and took hold. But, alas! it was not big enough to keep us both afloat. We looked at each other. For a time, one took hold while the other swam, and then we changed over.

We kept this up for a bit, but it was evident we were getting weaker. Neither of us spoke for a while, and then presently the Salvationist said: "Mate, death means life to me: you are not converted, you hold on to the spar and save yourself; I'll let go. Good-bye!"

And he let go and went down!

Grand-Père[1]

And so when he reached my bed
The General made a stand:
"My brave young fellow," he said,
"I would shake your hand."

So I lifted my arm, the right,
With never a hand at all;

[1] From *Rhymes of a Red-Cross Man*, by Robert W. Service.

Only a stump, a sight
Fit to appal.

"Well, well. Now that's too bad!
That's sorrowful luck," he said;
"But there! You give me, my lad,
The left instead."

So from under the blanket's rim
I raised and showed him the other,
A snag as ugly and grim
As its ugly brother.

He looked at each jagged wrist;
He looked but he did not speak;
And then he bent down and kissed
Me on either cheek.

You wonder now I don't mind
I had n't a hand to offer . . .
They tell me (you know I'm blind)
'T was Grand-père Joffre.

The Women of France

The Countess of Sancy announces the death of her son to her friends in the following words: —

It is with a proud and broken heart that I announce the death on the field of honor of my well-beloved Alain: with me you will weep for this incomparable son. Let us pray and cry: "Vive la France!"

An Alsatian, the widow Adam, lost her eldest son, and later her second son, slain at Dornach; weeping she writes thus to her daughter: —

His death is an honor to him and to us. I pray God for the success of our arms. Vive la France! la Belgique, l'Angleterre et la Russie!

A good woman who keeps a grocery in Noisy-le-sec, Mme. Galliwa, the mother of twelve children, has had

six sons slain by the enemy in the space of a few days, and she replies thus to a relative who had endeavored to comfort her: "I had rather they were all dead than to allow the Germans to enter France!"

All know the story of Edith Cavell, but it can never be told too often. She was in Brussels at the time of the invasion. Speaking of the German soldiers she wrote on August 24: —

We were divided between pity for these poor fellows, far from their country and their people, suffering the weariness and fatigue of an arduous campaign, and hate of a cruel and vindictive foe bringing ruin and desolation on hundreds of happy homes and to a prosperous and peaceful land.

After her arrest the Military Prosecutor asked her why she had helped these soldiers to go to England. "If I had not done so they would have been shot," she answered. "I thought I was only doing my duty in saving their lives. . . ."

Brand Whitlock, the American Minister at Brussels, wrote this appeal after she was condemned: —

My dear Baron, — I am too ill to present my request to you in person, but I appeal to your generosity of heart to support it and save this unfortunate woman from death. Have pity on her!

When she came to die she said: —

I have no fear nor shrinking. I have seen death so often that it is not strange or fearful to me.

I thank God for this ten weeks' quiet before the end. Life has always been hurried and full of difficulty. This time of rest has been a great mercy.

They have all been very kind to me. But this I would say, standing as I do in view of God and eternity, I realize that

patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness to any one.

She then repeated the hymn beginning: —

> Hold thou Thy cross before my closing eyes;
> Shine through the gloom and point me to the skies;
> Heaven's morning breaks, and earth's vain shadows flee;
> In life, in death, O Lord, abide with me.

Mr. Beck writes of her last moments: —

The German military chaplain was with her at the end and afterwards gave her Christian burial. He told me: "She was brave and bright to the last. She professed her Christian faith and that she was glad to die for her country. She died like a heroine."

. . . . . .

The dark secrecy of the execution gave rise to many false statements with respect to the nature of her end. As these exaggerated the horror of the deed and intensified the feeling of indignation against her executioners, they should be corrected. Some of these reputed details are too horrible for statement.

The facts as narrated by the German prison chaplain, who seems to have been a very noble and humane man, are very simple.

Miss Cavell walked bravely to the place of her execution and simply inquired where she should stand. This was indicated and she was asked whether she preferred to be blindfolded, to which she replied, "No." She folded her arms and then simply said to the firing squad, "I am ready," and was then instantly killed.

What words could describe the feelings of that firing squad when they saw the body of this brave and noble woman lying lifeless at their feet?

Thus died Edith Cavell, assuredly one of the noblest women in the history of the world. To her memory a statue is to be erected in Trafalgar Square, but no art could fashion a statue worthy of the nobility of her soul.

One can say of her, as was said of William the Silent,

who was also assassinated, that when she died "the little children cried in the streets."

I close with these words of Maeterlinck's on Edith Cavell: —

She passed like a flash of light which for one moment illumined that vast and innumerable multitude, confirming our confidence and our admiration. She has added a final beauty to the great revelations of this war; for the war, which has taught us many things that will never fade from our memory, has above all revealed us to ourselves. . . .

There was a moment of anguish and silence; and lo, suddenly, in the midst of this anguish and silence, the most splendid response, the most magnificent cry of resurrection, of righteousness, of heroism and sacrifice that the earth has ever heard since it began to roll along the paths of space and time! They were still there, the ideal forces! They were mounting upward, on every side, from the depths of all those swiftly-assembling souls, not merely intact, but more than ever radiant, more than ever pure, more numerous and mightier than ever! To the amazement of all of us, who possessed them without knowing it, they had increased in strength and stature while apparently neglected and forgotten.

THE END

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A